

and repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

277. Also, petition of Penn Lodge, No. 141, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in opposition to sales tax and repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. By Mr. TEN EYCK (by request): Petition signed by citizens of the twenty-eighth district of New York, to repeal the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, April 25, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we give Thee thanks for all the blessings vouchsafed unto us, for yesterday and its rest and its inspiration, and pray that help from the sanctuary may go with us through the toil and tasks of the week. Help us ever to remember Thee, and may our land be exalted in righteousness to the glory of Thy great name. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

JOHN K. SHIELDS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### ORDNANCE PATENTS TO GERMAN CITIZENS (S. DOC. NO. 6).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, inviting attention to the fact that there have been issued to German citizens in the United States Patent Office 201 patents pertaining to ordnance, which patents have been assigned to Frederick Krupp, of Essen, Germany, etc., and recommending corrective legislation in the premises, which was referred to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed.

### NEAR EAST RELIEF (S. DOC. NO. 5).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a complete report of the Near East Relief for the year ending December 31, 1920, which the trustees of that corporation desire substituted for the incomplete report laid before the Senate March 7, 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### TREATMENT OF EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the close of the routine morning business on Wednesday I shall make some observations on the governmental facilities for the care and compensation of veterans of the World War, and shall suggest some changes in existing laws for their welfare.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted by the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States at Philadelphia on April 12, 1921, favoring the restoration of the monument of Abraham Lincoln to its former location in front of the courthouse in Judiciary Square, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. RANDELL presented 54 petitions signed by 1,620 citizens of the State of Louisiana, praying that the republic of Ireland be recognized, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COLT presented a resolution of the board of aldermen of Newport, R. I., protesting against the enactment of legislation for the removal of the Naval War College from Newport, R. I., to Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a resolution of the board of aldermen of Newport, R. I., favoring the enactment of legislation to re-establish the second naval district and to maintain it until the present system of naval districts is abandoned and administrative authority is centered in the Navy Department, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of Division No. 237, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fort Scott, and Local No. 1610, Fancy Creek Farmers' Union, of Riley

County, both in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax law and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rochelle, Adel, Doerun, Morven, Ty Ty, Sumner, Ambrose, Willacoochee, Ray City, Montezuma, Warwick, Smithville, Pearson, Alapaha, Fender, Nashville, Hinsonton, Omega, McRae, and Empress, all in the State of Georgia, praying for a reduction in freight rates on watermelons, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

### PEACE WITH GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government, and for other purposes. I give notice that I shall call up the joint resolution to-morrow immediately after the routine morning business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator proposes to make it the unfinished business to-morrow, I understand?

Mr. LODGE. That is my plan.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose the Senator intends to let the resolution run a reasonable time before pushing it to a conclusion.

Mr. LODGE. I, of course, expect to have debate on it. I should like to get it through as soon as may be.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Probably to-morrow or the next day Senators on this side of the Chamber will not be prepared to carry on the debate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can relieve his mind in one respect. I have no intention of making a speech upon the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I may wish to make some remarks on it myself, but I shall not be prepared to do so to-morrow. It is not that I think there is any disposition on this side of the Chamber to delay it unduly, but I suppose the Senator does not intend to push it for a day or two or until an opportunity is given to discuss it.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not propose to be unreasonable about it, at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

### PRINTING OF TREATIES.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask to have printed as a Senate document various treaties in the possession of the Senate, including copies of treaties which have never been sent to it, the treaty of peace with Turkey, the treaty of peace with Hungary, and certain other agreements reached by the peace conference at Paris. I ask permission that the order shall cover also a treaty, which I have not here at this moment, between Bulgaria and the allied and associated powers.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, under the order just requested, how many copies will be printed?

Mr. SMOOT. About 1,674, I may say to the Senator. Most of them go to the libraries throughout the country. Each Senator will be entitled to two copies.

Mr. LODGE. If we desire to have more copies printed, that is very easily done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not desire any more. I think if each Senator has two, that will be sufficient. The Senator from Utah states that copies will go to all the libraries of the country, and that is the matter in which I have particular interest.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts whether it is the purpose to have these treaties printed as one document?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; to have them printed as one document.

Mr. KING. Or will each be treated separately?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am going to have them printed as one document, which I think will be more convenient.

Mr. KING. I think so, too.

Mr. LODGE. I shall have them arranged with that object in view. One or two more that will come from the State Department will be included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is made.

### FOREIGN DEPOSITARIES OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Mr. MCLEAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) au-

thorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositaries of public moneys in foreign countries and in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States, reported it without amendment.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1077) to authorize the payment of \$5,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Torahachi Uratake, a Japanese subject, killed at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, on November 25, 1915; and

A bill (S. 1078) to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject killed at Camp Geronimo, Mexico, May 25, 1916; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1080) to provide for the establishment of Battell National Park, in the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 1081) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Middletown, Conn., two German cannon or field-pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1082) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles H. Simmons; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1083) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newington, Conn., one German cannon or field-piece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 1085) authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish a system of mileage books to be issued at a reduced rate by all railroad companies engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1086) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to create in the United States Coast Guard the rank or grade of chief gunner, electrical, and to transfer thereto all the present incumbent supervisors and assistant supervisors of telephone lines in the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 1087) for the relief of H. L. McFarlin; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1088) granting an increase of pension to William Strang; and

A bill (S. 1089) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Kerlee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 1090) for the relief of Sarah E. Church; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1091) for the relief of Hannah Nelson Lundegren; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1092) to add certain lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., to the Jefferson National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 1093) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Dora Alexander Miller and Emma Alexander, in her own right and as administratrix of estates of Jennie Alexander, deceased, and of Charles T. Alexander, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 1094) to amend section 14 of the act of Congress approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 1095) to regulate interstate shipments of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 1096) to increase the cost of the public building at East Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1097) for the relief of Nicholas Gallegos; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1098) to authorize the consolidation and exchange of certain Government lands and privately owned lands, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1099) to amend section 2372 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1100) for releasing and quitclaiming of all claims of the United States to the west half of the west half of arpent lot 80 in the old city of Pensacola, Escambia County, Fla.; and A bill (S. 1101) for releasing and quitclaiming of all claims of the United States to the east half of arpent lot 80, old city of Pensacola, Escambia County, Fla. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1102) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the construction of a public building at York, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1103) for the relief of Frank Vumbaca; and

A bill (S. 1104) for the relief of Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1105) to correct the military record of Alexander W. Goodreau; and

A bill (S. 1106) to correct the military record of James Burke (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1107) to aid in the erection of a monument to Indian Timothy at his grave near Alpowa, Asotin County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1108) granting permission to Capt. Dorr F. Tozier to accept a gift from the King of Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1109) to provide compensation for employees of the United States separated from the service on account of injuries received while in the performance of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1110) validating and confirming conveyances of lands made by allottees on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 1111) for the relief of the heirs of Ko-mo-dal-kiah, Moses agreement allottee No. 33; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1112) authorizing the issuance of patent to the heirs of James Longmire;

A bill (S. 1113) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain land to Estella McReynolds;

A bill (S. 1114) for the relief of George L. Neff; and

A bill (S. 1115) for the relief of Henry States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1116) providing for the establishment of a radio station on Unga Island, Alaska; and

A bill (S. 1117) awarding a medal of honor to George Murphy, late private, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1118) to increase the limit of cost for the construction of the United States public building authorized at Juneau, Alaska; and

A bill (S. 1119) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Port Angeles, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1120) for the relief of Fanny A. Crocker; and

A bill (S. 1121) for the relief of the heirs of Ari Cantrell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1122) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1123) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to each of the several county seats in the State of Washington, captured German cannon, cannon balls or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls and shells, or gun carriages;

A bill (S. 1124) for the relief of James S. Huntington;

A bill (S. 1125) for the relief of Ralph Parsons;

A bill (S. 1126) for the relief of Edward Stewart;

A bill (S. 1127) for the relief of Thomas Huggins;

A bill (S. 1128) for the relief of Adam Culp;

A bill (S. 1129) for the relief of John Dalton;

A bill (S. 1130) for the relief of Willson Douglass;

A bill (S. 1131) for the relief of McAteer Shipbuilding Co.;

A bill (S. 1132) for the relief of Herman O. Kruschke; and

A bill (S. 1133) for the relief of Albert C. West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1134) for the relief of Ira M. Krutz;

A bill (S. 1135) for the relief of the Pacific Creosoting Co.;

A bill (S. 1136) for the relief of the M. A. Phelps Lumber Co.;

A bill (S. 1137) for the relief of W. H. Presleigh;

A bill (S. 1138) for the relief of Matilda Elizabeth West;



A bill (S. 1139) for the relief of Mary Wait;  
 A bill (S. 1140) for the relief of Caroline M. Killough;  
 A bill (S. 1141) for the relief of the estate of Frederick Heisinger;

A bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Nellie Harrington;  
 A bill (S. 1143) for the relief of William H. Hare;  
 A bill (S. 1144) for the relief of the heirs of L. A. Davis;  
 A bill (S. 1145) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua Curtis, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1146) for the relief of Charles A. Mayo; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1147) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 1148) to authorize the establishment of a fisheries experiment station on the coast of Washington; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1149) to pension soldiers who were in the military service during Indian wars and disturbances, and the widows, minors, and helpless children of such soldiers; to increase the pensions of Indian war survivors and widows; and to amend section 2 of the act of March 4, 1917; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1150) to amend the first paragraph of section 3 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended by section 405 of the transportation act, 1920; and to amend the first paragraph of section 15 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended by section 418 of the transportation act, 1920; and to repeal paragraphs 3 and 4 of section 13 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended by section 416 of the transportation act, 1920; and to repeal section 15a of the act to regulate commerce, as amended by section 422 of the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 1151) for the relief of William C. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 1152) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to establish in the National Bureau of Standards a division to be known as the Division of Construction and Housing; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 1153) authorizing the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. to construct a sidetrack into square No. 3620 of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 1154) for the construction of a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near the city of Dumas, Mo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1155) for the relief of Thomas J. Hunt, surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt; and

A bill (S. 1156) for the relief of Thomas J. Hunt, surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER (for Mr. WADSWORTH):

A bill (S. 1157) authorizing the sale of the Government's installations, improvements, interests, and lands connected with the water-supply system at or near Newport News and Fort Monroe, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1158) to prohibit admission to citizenship of persons who served in the military or naval forces of any nation engaged against the United States in the World War; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 1159) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Porter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 1160) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars and disturbances in Utah Territory from 1849 to 1869, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1161) to appropriate \$200,000 for the survey of public lands in Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) authorizing the appointment of a commission to confer with the Dominion Government or the provincial governments of Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick as to certain restrictive orders in council of the said Provinces relative to the exportation of pulp wood therefrom to the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from storm in the State of Arkansas and other States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CALDER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) admitting Emil S. Fischer to the rights and privileges of a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

#### NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

Mr. McCORMICK introduced a bill (S. 1084) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. McCORMICK subsequently, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported without amendment the bill (S. 1084) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes.

#### RECLASSIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from a previous day for the first reading.

A bill (S. 1079) to provide an equitable system for the valuation of the services of civilian employees of the Government, and making appropriations for personal services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, was read the first time by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the second reading of the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The morning business, I understand, is not yet concluded, and this is not regular morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the reading of the bill is in order now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not object to the first reading, but I do not want something to come up to interfere with morning business. I have no objection if it is in the regular order of morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the second reading of the bill?

Mr. STERLING. I object to its second reading at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the bill will lie on the table.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

#### AMENDMENT TO IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4075) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed.

#### INVESTIGATION OF AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS.

Mr. LENROOT submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the present condition of agriculture is such as to cause alarm for the future in that unless remedied the United States will in a few years be forced to import much of the food necessary for its own inhabitants; and  
 Whereas reputable farm organizations have by formal action in their conventions declared that the present deplorable condition of agriculture is due to discrimination against this basic industry in matter of credit, transportation, and marketing; and  
 Whereas it is commonly reported that notwithstanding the low prices of food products received by the producers thereof, the consumer is forced to pay an increase of several hundred per cent over such prices; and  
 Whereas producers of grains, cotton, and live stock are threatened with ruin if present conditions shall longer continue; and  
 Whereas there is produced in the United States an abundance of nearly all necessities of life, and with the elimination of waste and with economical marketing and distribution practices and a proper relation between prices the people of the United States should be and continue to be prosperous; and  
 Whereas it is the duty of Congress to determine the facts causing present conditions and to apply such remedies for the same as may be within its jurisdiction: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint commission is hereby created, to be known as the joint commission of agricultural inquiry, which shall consist of six Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate and six Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, the Senate members to be appointed from the membership of the following committees: Agriculture, Finance, Interstate Commerce, and Commerce; and the House members to be appointed from the membership of the following committees: Agriculture, Ways and Means, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Banking and Currency.*

Said commission shall investigate and report to Congress within 90 days after the passage of this resolution upon the following subjects:

1. The causes of the present condition of agriculture.
2. The comparative condition of industries other than agriculture.
3. The relation of prices of commodities other than agricultural products to such products.
4. The banking and financial resources and credits of the country, especially as affecting agricultural credits.
5. The marketing and transportation facilities of the country.

The commission shall also make such recommendations to Congress for the enactment of such legislation as will in its opinion assist in remedying present conditions and in restoring prosperity to the country.

The commission shall elect its chairman, and vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

The commission is authorized to sit during the sessions and recesses of Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such personal services and incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution; such expenses shall be paid from the contingent funds of the House and Senate in equal portions.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. DILLINGHAM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

#### THE RICE AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES.

Mr. ROBINSON. I submit a resolution which I ask be read by the Secretary, and when that shall have been done I shall ask to make a brief statement regarding it.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Committee on Agriculture, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate conditions respecting agricultural industries, products, and pursuits, the production, manufacture, and market conditions affecting products, particularly the production, milling, and marketing of rice. Said committee, or subcommittee, shall be empowered to hold hearings in Washington or elsewhere in the United States, to examine witnesses, and to issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses, and the production of books, papers, documents, memoranda, and correspondence. Said committee or subcommittee shall report from time to time its findings and recommendations to the Senate and shall make its final report on or before January 1, 1922.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I shall request the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement concerning the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and let them report on it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Undoubtedly before the resolution is finally acted upon it should be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but I think that, perhaps, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should first consider the resolution, and if that committee reports it, then I shall ask that, under the rules of the Senate, the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolution should be so referred before final action is taken upon it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Before final action is taken upon the resolution it should be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

My purpose in making this statement respecting the resolution now is to familiarize the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate with some of the circumstances which, I think, make necessary the investigation which is proposed by the resolution.

The authority of the committee under this resolution is quite general, and if the resolution passes it is expected that the committee will investigate a number of subjects relating to farm products and fluctuations in their market prices.

Adverse conditions probably brought about by a number of causes affect many important branches of agriculture. Especial attention is called to the rice industry in the United States, which is threatened with destruction. The crop grown in 1919 was both abundant and profitable, the producer receiving from \$2 to \$3 per bushel. The milling charge then was approximately 40 cents per barrel. The market price of rice now, if any market exists, has dropped down to 40 cents per bushel, while the milling charge has increased to \$1 per barrel. I mean to say that the present market price ranges from 30 to 50 cents per bushel, whereas it formerly ranged from \$2 to \$3 per bushel. The latter, however, was a very high price for rice. These prices affect the entire crop produced in 1920. The labor cost and the cost of supplies and seed aggregate more than twice the amount which rice farmers are receiving for their products.

Just prior to the beginning of the present year the Rice Millers' Association entered into a contract with the Rice Growers'

Association which seemed to contemplate a price of \$5 per barrel for Nos. 1 and 2 rice. The millers agreed to make advances to the farmers upon delivery of the rice. For a short time advances were made, but the information which has reached me shows that without consulting the producers the price was arbitrarily reduced to less than half the cost of production and all advances discontinued. Thousands of rice farmers were thus quickly driven from prosperity into hopeless bankruptcy.

The rice crop for the current year, as a result, has been reduced in acreage probably 50 per cent and many of those who are able to plant their crops find themselves unable to cultivate them because it is impossible to obtain the necessary loans. Banks throughout the rice belt have been unable to make collections of loans to rice farmers. It may be said to the credit of the banks generally that they have been generous and indulgent in their treatment of rice farmers who have borrowed from them.

Universal dissatisfaction and general suspicion that they have been unfairly dealt with by the Rice Millers' Association and "double-crossed" by the Rice Growers' Association prevail among the producers.

Many of the latter deposited their rice grown in 1920 in the mills in October, November, and December, and have been denied any information whatever as to what disposition has been made of their rice. In some instances they have been informed that the milling and other charges have practically consumed the proceeds of the entire crop. In almost every instance where reports have been secured the milling charge has been equivalent to one-half the amount received for the rice.

When the contract authorizing a milling charge of \$1 per barrel was made both the cost of labor and the market price of rice were high, the rice selling at \$5 per barrel.

The labor cost in the mills has since been reduced approximately 65 per cent, and the market price of rice has declined to something less than \$2 per barrel, or from 30 to 50 cents a bushel.

The Rice Millers' Association still charges \$1 per barrel for milling, but insists that, for some mysterious or technical reasons, the contract to make advances and to maintain the price has been abrogated.

The consumers of rice are paying 5 and 6 cents per pound for high grades in Little Rock, while producers of that commodity are realizing less than 2 cents.

In the hope that an investigation may disclose the true facts surrounding this industry and make possible its revival I am introducing this resolution.

I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be so referred.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF DEPARTMENTAL EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, as I understand, the pending motion is to refer to the Committee on Civil Service Senate bill 13, entitled "A bill to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field service, for the standardization of compensation therefor, and for other purposes." The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] had the floor the other day when on motion the Senate went into executive session. I do not know whether or not he wants to occupy any further time this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand that the motion is now pending, the Senate having adjourned after the motion had been made and discussed. The Senator will have to renew the motion if he desires to have it pending.

Mr. STERLING. Very well; I renew the motion that Senate bill 13, the title of which I have just stated, be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the bill be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am going to express the hope that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, where it belongs. I am not going to repeat what I said the other day, because I am willing to have a vote taken upon the reference of the bill now without any further discussion; but I wish at this time, if I am to say anything, to call particular attention to the fact that the bill provides direct appropriations of money. It repeals the provision of law providing a bonus of \$240 a year to Government employees; it makes provision to pay under the proposed reclassification sufficient of the money heretofore provided to pay the bonus, if the bonus provision is repealed and if the reclassification requires that amount. If under the reclassification more than \$240 a year



additional is required for each employee of the Government, then this bill provides that the amount required over and above the \$240 shall be appropriated.

The first bonus provision ever enacted came from the Appropriations Committee. Since the adoption of that provision, whenever the bonus question has been under discussion or acted upon by the Congress, it has always been upon a proposal which has come from the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill now under discussion is in part an appropriation bill. Both the reclassification bill proposed by the Senator from South Dakota and the one I have offered provide that hereafter appropriations shall be made to cover the compensation of the different employees of the Government in accordance with the classification to be established.

Ever since the first classification of employees was made, the question at the beginning and since has been referred to the Appropriations Committee; and no matter whether this bill is referred to the Civil Service Committee to-day or not, it will be acted upon, in every future appropriation made under it, by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator to define precisely what the situation is? As I understand, the motion now made by the Senator from South Dakota is to refer the bill which he has introduced to the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the pending motion.

Mr. FLETCHER. If that motion is lost, a motion will be made to refer it to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. A motion to refer a bill to a committee named can not be amended by suggesting another committee in that motion, as I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the rules a motion to amend can not be made; but every Senator who desires to have this bill referred to the Appropriations Committee will vote "no" upon the pending question, and if it is lost I shall immediately move that the bill be referred to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask what action has been taken, if any—I do not recall that any has been taken—with regard to the reference of the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. That is pending now, and the Senator from South Dakota has objected on two days to its reading, so it has gone over for its third reading until to-morrow.

Mr. FLETCHER. A motion will then be made to refer that bill to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. President, under the classification provided for in the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota it will be absolutely impossible for any employee of this Government to know under what group he will be classified. You can take the bill and take almost any employee of the Government of the United States and find out just what he is doing to-day, and he himself will not know under what group he will be placed. Employees of the Government have come to me and asked me, under that bill, where they would fall, and they themselves say that they can be classed in six different groups and fall within the definition of the pending bill.

I want to be perfectly frank with the Senate and say that if these two bills are referred to the Appropriations Committee I have not any doubt but that the Committee on Appropriations will report the one that is workable, that anyone can understand; and there is no employee in the Government service but that will know just where he belongs, and to what group, if that bill is reported and passed.

Mr. President, whatever classifications may be made, I want to have the employees of the Government paid for the work that they do, and not for the offices that they hold. I know that the labor organizations do not want it. I know that Mr. Luther C. Steward does not want it. I know that the Trade Union Legislative Council does not want it. Why? Because under the grouping as provided for in the pending bill the same injustices can be done to certain of the Federal employees after its passage that are done to-day.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, what was it that the Senator said? I could not hear on this side.

Mr. SMOOT. I say that if the pending bill becomes law, the same discrimination can be meted out to some of the employees of the Government that is meted out to them to-day.

Why, Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to tell Senators that the chief clerks of the bureaus and divisions of our Government virtually control the promotion of every employee in the Government service. Any employee who has not stand-

ing with the chief clerk of the division in which he or she works stands very little chance of promotion.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator tell some of us who are seeking for light what bearing that has on the reference of this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It has a great deal of bearing, for the reason that under the classifications and the groupings of the existing law, with all the 1,700 definitions that there are, you can not take any employee and place him under a grouping that fits his work exactly.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. McCORMICK. May I answer the Senator with another question? Is not that a matter of amendment and not of reference? If the bill be at fault, the committee which is to consider the bill, or the Senate later, can amend the bill.

The SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly right in saying that they could do it; but does the Senator think for a moment that if the bill goes to the Civil Service Committee it is going to be amended?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I submit in this connection that the Senate ought not to vote for the reference of bills because of action which it believes committees will take. That is a very dangerous precedent to lay down.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not laid that down, Mr. President.

Mr. McCORMICK. That is the substance of the Senator's argument.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator asked me a question, and I answered him, not as to the reference of the bill, but I answered his question.

Mr. McCORMICK. But then why was the Senator arguing a moment before that the bill contains these provisions which he condemned, and which he held would remain in the bill if referred to the committee presided over by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. That was not as to the question of reference. I was saying that that applied to the bill itself.

Mr. McCORMICK. But if it does not apply to the question of reference, why should the Senator bring it into this discussion?

Mr. SMOOT. Because it belongs in the discussion, because it has an effect upon the reference.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will allow me to proceed, I will go on.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator one question right there. It is called out by the Senator's answer to the Senator from Illinois. Why does the Senator from Utah persist in saying that there are 1,700 groups in this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say "groups"; I said "definitions."

Mr. STERLING. Or definitions. Why does the Senator say that?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, because there are that many in the original bill.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; but that is not the bill about which we are talking to-day. I stated the other day—

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I did not yield to the Senator for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am perfectly aware that every Senator has received this letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Trade-Union Legislative Council, of Washington, D. C., comprised of delegates from the national, international, and local unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labor, respectfully requests that you vote to have all bills introduced in the Senate of the United States having for their purpose the reclassification of salaries of Government employees referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Thanking you in advance for your favorable consideration of this request, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

FRANK J. COLEMAN, Secretary.

Mr. President, I have received telegrams from all parts of the United States, from people who have never read the bill, who know nothing about the bill, requesting that I have this bill referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. I know the propaganda that is on; I know just exactly what it means; and if this bill did not include a direct appropriation I should not be standing here asking that it go to the Committee on Appropriations. But we are repealing laws passed that came from that committee; we are providing means to take their place; and if there is not enough money appropriated already under the bonus bill that came from the Appropriations Committee and passed Congress, then the pending bill provides that that much more money shall be paid from the Treasury of the United States.

I think the reclassification ought to be had, and I hope that after the bill becomes a law we shall have Government employees doing the work that they are hired for. I have wondered what Dr. Rosa and Dr. Wolf are paid for. Are they paid as physicists in the Government service, or are they paid as lobbyists for this provision? I think that when they fall within a certain group, hereafter they ought to be paid for the work that they do, and not simply for the designation of the office that they hold.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything more. Whatever the Senate wants to do in this matter, of course it will do; but I do know that this subject in the past has been acted upon by the Appropriations Committee; I do know that the question is one that ought to go to the Appropriations Committee; and if the Senators want the proposed legislation to go to the proper committee, they will vote to refer this bill to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, on this matter of reference I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a similar case, that of reclassification of the employees of the Postal Service under the special joint commission known as the Bankhead Commission. That commission functioned over a period of time exceeding one year, assisted by experts, holding hearings in different parts of the country, collating necessary information, and formulating a report which was submitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. It was my privilege to work for a part of the time with that committee. No question was ever raised as to the proper reference of that bill. It was properly and naturally referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; it was reported out favorably, and passed during the closing day of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PHIPPS. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. I did not quite catch the bill to which the Senator referred.

Mr. PHIPPS. I am referring to the postal salary bill, which was passed, if my memory serves me, on June 5, 1920—a bill in the formulation of which the Senator from South Dakota took a very prominent part, and also as a member of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee in reporting out the bill favorably and having it passed by the Senate. It seems to me the case is similar.

Mr. STERLING. But, Mr. President, the bill was the bill of the joint commission especially appointed for the purpose of investigating in regard to the Postal Service, and in connection with the report that commission presented a bill. The bill was presented in the Senate. I had the honor of presenting it, being at the time, I think, acting chairman of the commission; and the same bill was presented in the House.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is true; but the Senator requested that that report be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, not to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. STERLING. But, Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is other than a mere appropriations committee.

Mr. PHIPPS. But acting on appropriations is one of the chief functions of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The activities of the committee will show that its really important work is that of recommending appropriations, and not the mere formality of passing upon nominations for positions in the Postal Service, such as the appointment of postmasters.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact, too, that the salary of every employee who is affected is passed upon by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is true, and also the vast majority have a civil-service status.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; a civil-service standing.

Mr. PHIPPS. They are under the civil-service rules of the Government.

It seems to me, Mr. President, there is no question as to the proper reference of the bill under discussion. It properly belongs to the Committee on Appropriations. The Appropriations Committee has worked on the bill, through its subcommittee, for quite a period of time. That work was not even interrupted during the interval between the Sixty-sixth and the Sixty-seventh Congresses, but it has been carried along as expeditiously as possible under the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], ably seconded by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the reference of the bill.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have very little to say. But I want to say to my friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and to the Senate, that during my service on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate many times bills have been referred to that committee from which I have asked to have that committee discharged and that they be referred to other committees. I am sure I have never sought to have a bill which properly belonged to another committee taken from that committee and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The issue now before the Senate, as it is presented, probably may not be understood without some explanation. The whole matter of classifications and the fixing of salaries has always been handled by the Committee on Appropriations through its different subcommittees. Certain salaries were established away back in 1853 as to clerks in classes 1, 2, 3, and 4. Certain other salaries—of typists, messengers, and others—were taken care of in a statute passed in 1879. In 1883 the Civil Service Commission was established for the purpose of examining applicants for service and taking care of the distribution of the Government employees among the different States. That was, in a way, to relieve against the so-called spoils system, and also to give every State, near or far, its proper proportion of appointments in the Government service.

With various new issues coming up from time to time, and with so many lump-sum appropriations being made, the Committee on Appropriations sought legislation, and it was secured, to provide for a reclassification commission. The report of that commission, although on no motion of mine, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and thus the question came back to that committee.

The Committee on Appropriations provided for the work, it provided for specialists, and on one occasion, I think just about the time we were near adjourning at the close of the last session, my friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] undertook to take the consideration of the reclassification matter away from the Committee on Appropriations. So, with all respect to that Senator, and with all respect to his committee, it is that committee and that Senator who are now striving to take away from the committee to which the report was properly referred, as I look at it, the jurisdiction over this subject. Certainly the Senate itself had decided on three different occasions that it belonged to the Committee on Appropriations.

Under those conditions I felt, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that we should proceed with greater vigor and with more assistance, and I stayed here, as did other members of the committee, all through the recent vacation, none of us taking even a half-day vacation—at least I did not. So, on behalf of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has presented a bill. I have not read the bill which has been presented by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and have not even seen it. I have presumed, from some remarks the Senator made, that it was drawn largely upon the lines of the Lehlbach bill, which, in its first print, contained between four and five hundred pages. I have studied that bill very carefully, and before I go any further I want to say that I was in hopes, without regard to where the bill came from, that it would be one we could indorse and use, at least as a basis of legislation.

But when considering these thousands and tens of thousands of appropriation items every year, as the Committee on Appropriations does, all of the papers referring to the matters covered by the bills are before that committee. Members of that committee are perfectly familiar with the salaries, the positions, and the numbers employed and asked for, and it would seem, without any disrespect to the author or to the bill on the House side—which, by the way, was never reported by a committee—as if it had been drawn without any reference to the facts and figures contained in the report of the Reclassification Commission.

The Reclassification Commission did great work, but they were very diffusive, and their report covered something like a thousand pages, or over a thousand pages, and they put before us one thousand seven hundred and odd classifications.

I think it is perfectly patent to the mind of any legislator that to subdivide the employees of this Government into 1,700 classes, each of which may differ from the others as to salary and duties, would bring chaos into the departments if the classification was followed, because if you should ask a man who was selected under one of those 1,700 heads to perform a duty coming under one of the others, he might, and probably would, have, if not the right, the privilege of saying, "That is not the



class I am working in. Go to some other class." Hence we would have men in the different classes standing about idle in the different positions because of this great diversity of classifications.

The bill which has been introduced on the part of the Committee on Appropriations provides for 18 or 19 different classes or groups; but the heads of departments have a latitude in order to provide for efficiency and advancement, so that in each group the salaries can be made large or small, as the heads of the departments may decide, from a consideration of the efficiency of the employees.

There were so many thousand new employees to be taken into the Government service that before we proceeded a great many years it was necessary to establish in the service an efficiency system, and by an act of Congress there was a Bureau of Efficiency established. That was simply one of the factors which seemed to Congress to be neglected, and so before long it was taken out and made a specific bureau, reporting through the Civil Service Commission. But it seemed to the Congress that that was not pursuing the correct order, so it was made an independent bureau, reporting to the President, and so it remains to-day.

In this grouping of salaries the departments, upon the question of efficiency, may have a play of three or four or possibly in extreme cases five hundred dollars per annum in the salary of a man, as it may go up or down. I have had a most careful calculation made as to where it will land us, in the total, whether it will be a larger sum than we are now appropriating for salaries, and I am inclined to think that it will amount to slightly more, or perhaps quite a little more, than do the present salaries, with the bonus added. But with the grouping that is made, if the departments think they should commence with the minimum in each line, then we would be just about where we are now, with the salaries and bonus.

If, for instance, another war or any other circumstance should cause a necessity for an increase in salaries, it could be taken care of easily by a percentage of rise rather than as we have been obliged to do in this matter of bonus.

In case of a lowering of values to any great extent, as was the case many years ago, a percentage could be subtracted; but in both cases it would have to be done by legislation beyond the limit of the grouping.

The Civil Service Commission has nothing whatever to do with salaries, and never has had. It simply certifies, in percentages, as to the capability of applicants for positions, and when appointed they are distributed under the different salaries that have already been fixed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to inquire whether under the bill as introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] there will be any reduction in the pay of employees? Would the employees under that bill receive practically what they are now receiving, plus the bonus, or will there be a reduction?

Mr. WARREN. The proposition is to provide new salaries and do away with the bonus; but, taking the entire matter through, these new proposals cover the bonus and salary.

Mr. FLETCHER. That practically means that there will be no reduction?

Mr. WARREN. There will be no aggregate reduction, and there will be very few, if any, reductions, and they would not take place until the end of the term for which the present salaries are appropriated.

I will say to the Senator, however, that the Lehlbach bill—and the Senator from South Dakota can state whether his bill provides in that way or not—provides that the least compensation that can be offered any employee of the Government is \$1,080 a year, except as to those who only work part of the time or who have housing and subsistence. The other bill varies in that respect, because there are those who are messenger boys and charwomen and people who can only do certain very light work, who perhaps are demoted from higher salaries, but in the meantime there is a better average, and I think a slightly higher average than the ordinary lines where men suffer the most because of the high cost of living.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question for the purpose of obtaining information to enable me to vote intelligently upon the motion to refer. I have not had an opportunity to examine the bill, and I am not altogether familiar with its provisions.

Reclassification of the employees of the Government is, as I understand it, a matter of legislation. The fixing of the salaries

of Government employees is also a matter of legislation. The providing of the money with which to pay the salaries of employees of the Government is a question of appropriations.

The question I wish to ask the Senator is, Does the bill, after reclassifying the employees of the Government, merely seek to establish the salaries of those employees, or does it, in addition to that, also appropriate the money necessary to pay the salaries?

Mr. WARREN. It does; that is, it will take care of—

Mr. STERLING. No, Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to answer the question, and then he can correct me if I am wrong?

Mr. STERLING. The Senator had already answered that part of it.

Mr. WARREN. Appropriations for the next fiscal year, generally speaking, have already been made largely in the legislative bill and other appropriation bills, but this bill does appropriate any amount that may be sufficient to make up so much as this classification may fall short, if any, of the appropriations that have already been made, including, of course, the bonuses, so that in fairness we shall do by these employees as we should if it were a matter of conference.

Mr. SIMMONS. In other words, as I understand the Senator, the bill does not appropriate for the payment of the regular salaries of the officials and employees, but only makes an appropriation to cover any difference between the salaries as they now exist and the salaries as they will exist after the passage of the bill readjusting the salaries.

Mr. WARREN. Except as we do away with the bonus, and then we do appropriate or reappropriate entirely for the next year the amounts appropriated heretofore, so that they conform to the proposed new law.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the bill itself, as I understand the Senator from Wyoming, does not attempt to make appropriations for the regular salaries, but only for the little difference between the present salaries and the readjusted salaries.

Mr. WARREN. And a reappropriation, as I said, to cover all the others.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator another question. Do we not always, by bills that are regarded purely as legislative, first establish the salaries which employees are to receive, and has not that always heretofore been regarded as a legislative function and not necessarily a matter that should go to the committee that has charge of the appropriation of money? Of course, the appropriations follow from year to year, but the appropriations only follow for the purpose of carrying out the legislative enactment. Is not that the only connection that the Appropriations Committee has with this matter?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator evidently—

Mr. SIMMONS. I am asking the Senator for information.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator evidently, with his great information on the question of producing revenue or rather not producing what should have been produced, has overlooked the fact that the salaries are made in every appropriation bill that we pass for this or that or some other project. It is true that away back years ago, and it was then done by the Appropriations Committee, they established certain salaries for certain classes; that is, clerks in class 1 should have \$1,200, clerks in class 2 should have \$1,400, class 3 \$1,600, class 4 \$1,800, and so on.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I ask the Senator if that classification was not done by the Committee on Appropriations of the House, headed by Mr. Holman, of Indiana?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. It fixed the classification, and ever since that the Appropriations Committee has handled the question.

Mr. WARREN. Our record shows it was first in 1853 when they provided for the first, second, and third classes, \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, and \$1,800, and in 1879 they provided for \$900, \$1,000, and \$720 salaries. It has always been and is to-day the province of the Appropriations Committee. First, it gets the estimate from the department that they want so many clerks, so far as they can give the number; but outside of that more of the statements come to us to-day stating that they want so many clerks at such and such salaries, stating what their salaries will be, and so all that is settled by the Congress after it has been passed upon by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STERLING rose.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to interrupt me?

Mr. STERLING. I desire to add the following to my motion for reference of the bill. I will send it to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the reclassification bill be referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and when reported by that committee it shall be committed to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and recommendation as to all matters fixing salaries, and that when reported from that committee the bill shall come before the Senate upon the report or recommendation of both committees as to salaries.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator for a moment.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not ask the Senator to yield. I did not know the Senator had the floor. I thought the Senator from South Dakota made a motion, and I wish to be heard on that motion.

Mr. STERLING. I just submit that as a part of my motion.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator favor me with a little explanation of it?

Mr. NORRIS. If it is unanimous consent that is asked, as the Secretary put it, I wish to object to it. If it is a motion, I wish to be heard on it.

Mr. STERLING. It is a motion. It is not a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a part of the original motion made by the Senator from South Dakota. I wish to add at this time that if the motion carries I shall move that the bill now lying on the table for a second reading, introduced by me on the same subject, shall be referred under the same provision.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator from South Dakota to present it as a unanimous-consent agreement. I understand now that it takes the form of an amendment to his motion to refer. Does the Senator from South Dakota present it as a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. STERLING. No; it is not presented as a unanimous-consent request. It is presented as a part of my own motion to refer.

Mr. WARREN. Let me ask the Senator whether his understanding carries his bill and the bill of the Senator from Utah to the Committee on Civil Service first?

Mr. STERLING. That is the understanding—that both the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah and the bill introduced by myself shall go to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. WARREN. Having been reported from the Committee on Civil Service, where does it then go?

Mr. STERLING. The addition to my motion states that when it is reported by the Committee on Civil Service it will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations for that committee's recommendations as to salaries, and then there will be before the Senate the reports of the two committees in regard to one thing—the salaries.

Mr. BORAH. When we refer it to the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of fixing salaries, how are we going to limit the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and prevent it from doing whatever it wants to do with it after it gets it?

Mr. STERLING. The motion limits it to the matter of fixing salaries, and not to the text of the bill, the legislative part of the bill, aside from the fixing of the salaries. That is expressly understood. The motion so provides, and it is understood by those with whom I have talked in regard to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question? Suppose the Committee on Appropriations does not report upon the bill at all, what would be the situation? Would it be before the Senate or would we be compelled to defer it until a report came in?

Mr. STERLING. If the Appropriations Committee does not report it, I think there will be one report before the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. In such a case the Senator from Tennessee, or any other Senator, could move to have the committee discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, may I ask that the Secretary report again the motion to refer as amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from South Dakota moves that the reclassification bill be referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and when reported by that committee it shall be committed to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and recommendation as to all matters fixing salaries, and when reported from the committee the bill shall come

before the Senate upon the reports or recommendations of both committees as to salaries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to say something before we come to a vote on that subject, but the motion to refer does not name the bill. Does this motion refer solely to the bill of the Senator from Utah or does it refer to the bill of the Senator from South Dakota or to both bills?

Mr. STERLING. It refers primarily to the bill of the Senator from South Dakota, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, but by oral agreement here since I amended the motion the other bill also will be referred to the Civil Service Committee for like procedure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senate can not vote on oral agreements on the other side of the Chamber. I hope the Senator will make his motion definite enough for us to know what we are voting on.

Mr. SMOOT. I have already stated to the Senate that the bill which I introduced, now lying on the table, with reference to the same subject matter, I shall ask to have go in the same way that this bill goes, and follow the same procedure.

I will say to the Senator that if the bill had been read the third time and had been printed, the bill would have been given a number and could now be referred to by number, but the bill has not yet been printed, and, therefore, it is referred to as "the classification bill."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that the proposition now made, if adopted, will establish a very dangerous precedent. I had rather have the bill go, to begin with, to the Committee on Appropriations and have it over with. According to my idea of the rules and the duties of the committees, the Appropriations Committee has no jurisdiction whatever of the bill. It is a matter entirely of legislation, and the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee. If this particular motion is carried and is to be regarded as a precedent, more than half of the legislation which is reported by the various committees of this body will, after being reported, have to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations for their recommendation as to salaries.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. While the Committee on Appropriations is a committee which is primarily established to pass on and report as to appropriations, there is no rule or law or understanding which would prevent that committee from acting on and reporting other measures of legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, there is not any direction in the rules, with, perhaps, one or two exceptions, as to the duties of any of our committees, but everybody knows what the Appropriations Committee is, and that half of the legislation which we pass provides for salaries. Suppose the rule which is now sought to be invoked had been in force when we provided for the Children's Bureau, the Department of Labor, or any other bureau or department, for instance, the War Finance Bureau which we had during the war; you may go through them all and it will be found that more than half of our legislation provides for salaries and fixes the compensation that officials and employees shall receive. If this precedent is to be established, every time such action is taken, after a bill is reported to the Senate, it must then be referred to the Committee on Appropriations to ascertain what they think about the establishment of the proposed offices and concerning the salaries sought to be fixed.

Mr. WARREN. In every case such as the Senator from Nebraska speaks of, the Committee on Appropriations is appealed to if not the next year, then the second year, and thereafter to appropriate still larger sums than are carried by the bill in the original instance. Increases are asked for every year.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose they are. Every committee has its difficulties. It is no argument in answer to what I have said to say that the next year after a bureau is established and the salaries therein are fixed somebody may come before the Appropriations Committee and ask that they be increased. I suppose the Committee on Appropriations are bored to death with requests of that character, and they will be bored still more if bills of the kind now pending are referred to them in the first instance. If they want to avoid that kind of difficulty, they ought to favor the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. President, I have no personal interest whatever in this matter. I am not a member of either committee. I only want to bring about orderly procedure. I submit, however, if we are going to adopt this rule in this case, everybody knows it will hereafter be cited as a precedent; and every time we have pending here a bill—and Senators may ascertain from the



calendar how many such bills there are—which provides for some official or some new office, it may be, or fixes a salary or changes the salary of some official who is already in existence, the bill will have to go to the Committee on Appropriations. If, outside of the establishment of a new office, it embodies legislation such as is contained in this bill, then a part of the bill will go to one committee and a part to another. That is in reality what we are proposing to do here.

The proposition is to refer the bill to the Committee on Civil Service, and when that committee reports the bill, that it shall then go to the Committee on Appropriations, in order to get their judgment as to whether or not the Civil Service Committee in establishing the offices and fixing the salaries to be paid have done so correctly. If the idea is that the Appropriations Committee is the only competent committee to pass upon such matters, then 90 per cent of all the bills which come in here ought to be referred to that committee.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say to the able Senator from Nebraska, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that I do not think he will accuse the Appropriations Committee of controlling the salaries in the bill over which that committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. NORRIS. No; but the camel is getting his nose under the tent right here—

Mr. WARREN. Not at all.

Mr. NORRIS. And subsequently the incident will be remembered when it is proposed to provide for something else.

Mr. WARREN. The Committee on Appropriations is merely proposing to take care of what it has always heretofore taken care of.

Mr. NORRIS. I doubt that somewhat. Certainly I mean no discourtesy to the Committee on Appropriations when I say that I am not in favor of turning over all the committee work of the Senate to that committee, able as they are; but here is the beginning; here is a proposition now concerning a bill which provides for the classification of officers and employees, the changing of salaries, and the fixing of duties of officials, but which does not contain an appropriation. The proposition now is to let the bill go to the Committee on Civil Service and then when it is reported by that committee, before the Senate may act upon it, it must go to the Committee on Appropriations to ascertain what they think about it.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, let me say just a word—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia, who, I think, first addressed the Chair.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. I did not know that the Senator from Nebraska still had the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have not surrendered the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I ask the Senator from Wyoming if he will let me take a little longer time?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Nebraska has now been talking for some time.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations must have its way, and I will sit down, Mr. President.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I rose to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. I have been standing here for some time.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I thought a parliamentary inquiry was always in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A parliamentary inquiry is always in order. The Senator from Georgia will state his inquiry.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Did not the Senator who has charge of the bill, the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. LODGE. Unanimous consent is not needed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota did not ask unanimous consent, but made a motion.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I understood the Senator to ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator may accomplish his purpose by a motion. It is merely an instruction to a committee.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Georgia was misled by the statement, I presume, that the Senator from South Dakota made when he rose and asked for a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear that at all. There was no such request put.

Mr. NORRIS. It was so stated at the desk.

Mr. LODGE. Then it is time to say that unanimous consent is not required. It is a question of instructions to a committee. The committees are the creatures of the Senate, and it is within the power of the Senate to give them any instructions they choose.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. One moment. Bills are constantly referred with instructions. I think some similar arrangement was made in connection with the water power bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, that is the fact.

Mr. LODGE. In that case two committees were given instructions in regard to the measure. In this instance there has been a contest over the reference of the bill. The bill will carry with it inevitably enormous changes in salaries affecting the finances of the Government, and, if the Committee on Civil Service is going to frame the bill, I think that it would save a great deal of time if we could have the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee as to those proposed changes and as to the effect on the Treasury. That question will have to be decided in connection with this bill. I hope that the request of the Senator from South Dakota will be complied with.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FLETCHER. The inquiry is whether this question can arise under a motion to amend the motion of reference. I think it subject to a point of order, but I do not care to make the point of order. I think, however, that the proposition ought to be changed so as to provide for reference to the committee with instructions in accordance with the position stated by the Senator from Massachusetts—

Mr. LODGE. Precisely; I think that is correct; the motion can not be amended.

Mr. FLETCHER. And not as an amendment to a motion to refer, which I think is out of order.

Mr. LODGE. I do not put it on the ground of an amendment; the motion can not be amended.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then I think the language ought to be changed so that reference shall be provided for with instructions to report back to the Senate under the rule for such further disposition of the matter as is desired.

Mr. LODGE. That would involve merely a simple verbal change.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The inquiry is as to whether or not any motion is in order to determine what shall be done in the way of reference of a bill at some future time. The motion, as I understand, is a double motion; part of it is to refer the bill to the Civil Service Committee, and of course that is in order; but is it in order at this time for the Senator to make a motion that at some future time, after the measure has been reported by the committee, the nature of the report being now necessarily unknown, it shall then at that future time be referred to a certain other committee? Should not the matter wait until the report is made and the Senate then determine what shall be done with it?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in regard to that point of order, it is perfectly obvious that an instruction can not relate to the past; it must relate to the future. Every instruction that we ever give to a conference committee or any other committee, of course, must relate to their future conduct. In this instance we instruct the committee when they have completed their bill and are ready to report it, to report it here, and, if necessary, that it shall go then to the Appropriations Committee; that they shall submit it to the Appropriations Committee for consideration on one point.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I submit that that part of the motion is not an instruction to a committee. The Committee on Civil Service can not make a report to the Committee on Appropriations. I submit that it is not in order to require one committee of the Senate to make a report to another committee of the Senate. It is only in order for a committee of the Senate to make a report to the Senate, and the so-called instruction to the committee is nothing more nor less than an order which is supposed to be made by the Senate at this time as to what shall be done at some future time with the report of a committee. It is not an instruction to the com-

mittee; it is a commitment of the Senate as to what the Senate will do with the report when it is presented.

Mr. LODGE. We propose to instruct the committee what it shall do at a certain stage of the proceedings in connection with the bill. The Senate's power over its committees is absolute. It can instruct them in any way it desires, and the Senator from South Dakota having offered this instruction, put in proper form, I think it ought to have unanimous support, for I think such action will be for the good of legislation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was about to say—

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WARREN. I will yield in a few moments.

As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I have not the slightest interest in what committee may do the work of the Senate, provided it is well done. I have believed, however, that the Senate Committee on Appropriations knows more about salaries and positions, and so forth, than any other committee. We have nearly enough to do in the Committee on Appropriations. We have before us now estimates for about \$300,000,000 asked for by the various departments in connection with deficiencies. It would seem as if it were idle to quarrel about small matters. So far as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, he is a man of peace, and I take it the Senator from South Dakota is, as I have always thought him to be, a man of strict honor. I have no further questions to ask and no further resistance to offer to the motion as the Senator from South Dakota now presents it as amended.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word or two partly in answer to some suggestions that have been made here. As I view it, the Committee on Civil Service surrenders no material right. It will make its report on the legislative aspects of the bill proper and upon the salary schedules of the bill after due consideration and study of the measure. Then it will eventually come before the Senate, anyhow, and the fact that it may go to the Appropriations Committee after we have made a report for recommendation on the part of the Appropriations Committee will not prevent the assertion of the rights of the Civil Service Committee or prevent the assertion of the justice of their salary schedule. It will be in the end for the Senate to determine. There may be no marked disagreement between the two committees, but the Senate will have the ideas of the Appropriations Committee and the ideas of the Civil Service Committee. I hope, Mr. President, that the Civil Service Committee will present such a report on the bill, including the salary schedule, that it will meet the approval of the Senate; but, in any event, the Senate will have the different viewpoints and can thrash out the question here. For that reason I do not think the Civil Service Committee sacrifices any material rights in the matter.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, just a word.

I do not think this motion is in the nature of instructions to a committee. It is plainly a question of reference. The Senate is about to determine what committee or committees shall consider this bill. It is in order for the Senate to refer the bill to any single committee; it has been held that it is in order to refer it to two committees acting jointly; and it seems to me it is clearly in order to provide now that it shall be considered first by one committee, and then that any portion of it may be considered by another committee. It is all a question of reference that it is proper to decide and dispose of at this time, so I think it is entirely in order.

In reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Washington, it is not the report that is to be referred or submitted to the Appropriations Committee. When the Civil Service Committee makes its report, that report stands here. Under this motion the bill, or certain portions of the bill, is then referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and they make their report; and, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, the Senate will then act upon the two reports. The Civil Service Committee has lost nothing, but, in my judgment, the course proposed will very greatly expedite the consideration and the passage of this bill. It will avoid the delays that I think any Senator must see will ensue if the Committee on Civil Service alone considers the matter.

In the interest of the bill itself, I believe the motion should prevail.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am sorry that I can not agree with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] on the proposition that this motion, if agreed to, will bring about expeditious action. The result will be just the contrary. It means delay; and I think we ought to discard the idea of any feeling in favor of either committee. That question, to my mind, is not involved. Whether we take it all away from one committee or

all away from the other, or divide it up, we ought not to consider the committees themselves. The bill must be referred somewhere; but now we have started on a new method of legislation, if we carry out this practice.

We have a bill and it provides in some of its provisions for some salaries. It changes existing law in regard to salaries. It reclassifies some of the departments; and because it fixes salaries and classifies salaries, the Appropriations Committee wants it. Because it is legislation and pertains to the civil service of the Government, the Committee on Civil Service wants it; and so they compromise, and, in my judgment, that compromise is worse than either one of the other propositions.

It divides it up, and, rather than making it expeditious, it brings about delay. When one committee reports a measure to the Senate, automatically it must be referred to another committee before the Senate will consider it. That is this motion. It changes law somewhere. Where is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee? Why is he not saying here: "Why, this bill changes a law here or there; it ought to go to the Judiciary Committee, which has charge of laws?"

I presume that if we were to examine the bill closely we could find some parts of it that could go to every committee of the Senate, excepting one, and that is the Committee on Appropriations, because there is no appropriation in the bill; but the Committee on Appropriations wants a part of it, and so we say: "Here is a bill; we will refer it to the committee where it ought to go, and when it comes back it must then go to the Appropriations Committee."

I concede that when this committee reports the bill back it would be perfectly proper for the Senate to refer it to any other committee on any proposition. It could refer it to the Judiciary Committee to get its judgment on a question of law. I have not read the bill, but I presume there are things in it that pertain to employees in the Agricultural Department. When it comes back, why should we not refer that part of the bill to the Agricultural Committee? There are others that refer to the Post Office Department. Why not refer them to the Post Office Committee, and so on, all around?

Why, Mr. President, we are just letting the camel put his nose under the tent. This is going to be a precedent, and we all know what precedents mean in the Senate. It is going to be cited, and properly cited, any time that the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wyoming wants something to go to the Appropriations Committee.

Most of the argument made by the Senator from Utah, who is willing now to divide up these honors with the other committee, was made as against the bill. He made the argument, and it might have been perfectly good, that the bill was not good, anyway; there were some provisions in it that were bad. That is not what we are going to decide now, and I do not know that we would decide it if we should send the bill to the Appropriations Committee, because as yet it has not been demonstrated, at least, that the Appropriations Committee is perfection. Its members are human. They may make mistakes, notwithstanding their great authority and their recognized ability. It is not a question of whether or not we ought to pass this bill. If we did that with other bills, then before we referred any bill we would discuss its merits, and see whether it was good or not, and if we thought it was not good we would not refer it, or at least we would not refer it to any committee except the Committee on Appropriations.

That really is the effect of the argument; and I believe, Senators, unimportant as this may seem on its face, that it is an extremely important thing for the Senate to consider whether we are going to establish now the precedent of sending to the Appropriations Committee parts of bills where an office is created or an office is changed or a salary is changed or classified. If we are going to do that, then we are in for more delay than unlimited debate ever brought about in this body. We are going to have two references of every important measure. Whenever any group of Senators desire to fight a bill or a subject matter with which a bill deals, and want to delay it, they will invoke this precedent when it comes in, and have it go to the Appropriations Committee, because nine times out of ten they will find as good a reason as we can find in this bill for sending it to that committee; and that means more delay. That means, before the Senate can get hold of it, that it must be censured by the Committee on Appropriations; and I think it is a dangerous proposition. It is one that is going to come home to trouble us.

I would rather turn this bill over to the Committee on Appropriations now and not have this precedent established, but I do not think it ought to go there. I do not believe there is any reason why it should go there. It properly belongs to the other committee, which deals with civil-service officials and civil-



service matters. It ought to go there, but it would not be a serious thing to send it somewhere else, as bills sometimes go, by mistake or otherwise, and sometimes by default, to some committee that ought not to have them. But instead of starting here the precedent of dividing it up, and providing in advance that when this committee reports we are going to send the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, why not send it there in the first place?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrell	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Harris	Myers	Spencer
Broussard	Harrison	Nelson	Stanfield
Bursum	Heflin	New	Stanley
Calder	Johnson	Nicholson	Sterling
Cameron	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Swanson
Caraway	Kellogg	Oddie	Townsend
Colt	Kendrick	Overman	Trammell
Cummins	Kenyon	Phipps	Underwood
Curtis	Keyes	Polindexter	Warren
Dial	King	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
Dillingham	Ladd	Ransdell	Watson, Ind.
Ernst	La Follette	Reed	Weller
Fernald	Lenroot	Robinson	Willis
Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Shields	
Gooding	McKinley	Shortridge	
Hale	McNary	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the business before the Senate, in referring these bills on reclassification, undoubtedly presents a very important question. It involves the salaries and the working conditions of nearly all the employees of the United States Government. If the work of reclassification and reestablishment of salaries is done well, it will in the end work to the great good of the American people and the satisfaction of the employees of the Government. If the bills are poorly constructed, ill considered, or made by compromise, the question will still be open, to the injury of the taxpayers and the dissatisfaction of the employees. I think the Senate should seriously consider the problem, and consider it in such a way that the real viewpoint of the Senate may be reflected in the legislation. I do not believe the pending motion will accomplish that result.

To analyze the question which is before the Senate we must go back a little way. In the Sixty-fifth Congress, when this side of the Chamber was in control, recognizing that the salaries of most of the Government employees were not adequate to meet conditions which then existed, and realizing the impossibility during war conditions of the Committee on Appropriations being able to readjust them satisfactorily, a temporary expedient was adopted in the provision for a so-called bonus, which ultimately resulted in the payment to Government employees who drew salaries of less than \$2,500 of \$240 a year in addition to their regular salaries.

Then a commission was appointed to investigate the question of salaries and report back to the Congress. The commission went further than the direct instructions of the Congress and reported back not only on the question of salaries but on the question of classification and working conditions. The report was so voluminous and went so far afield from the original proposal, and came so near the close of that Congress, that there was no opportunity to act upon it. That report was, I think, before all three of the sessions of the last Congress. The other side of the Chamber made no effort to act upon it. They came into control in the meantime and no legislative proposal has been made to the Congress up to this time. Now, for the first time, some definite proposal is coming before the Congress for action, and the first thing that confronts us is a motion whose adoption would have the effect of making the issue as indefinite as possible.

Of course, I realize the situation. In my judgment, neither of the committees which are contending for the bills has jurisdiction of the matter, under the rules of the Senate. The Senate has created a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and if the question of paying salaries does not come as near to the question of expenditures in the executive departments as anything could, I can not define the meaning of ordinary English. But I have no particular desire to have the bills referred to that committee.

I do not see that there is any jurisdiction whatever of this matter in the Committee on Civil Service. The duty of that committee is to provide for the appointment of clerks, under a classified service, by examination, and not by the spoils system of political preferment, to arrange for their examina-

tion, and to provide for their induction into the service. The principal thing that stands to the credit of the Committees on Civil Service in the two Houses of Congress in the last 35 years, if it is a credit, is that they have not amended the original civil-service laws in any marked degree. The question that was originally taken up by the Sixty-fifth Congress, more than two years ago, related entirely to paying the Government clerks adequate salaries, and of course you can not establish a salary basis without defining the employment for which the salary is paid. It is not a civil-service classification; it is a classification of the employees based on the value of their services to the Government, in order that salaries may be fixed.

That work heretofore has always gone to the Committee on Appropriations. I think it is nearly 40 years since the Government last classified the salaries of employees, and designated the clerks who should receive particular salaries, and the classes of work they should do.

Unfortunately, that classification was based largely on the idea of title, and not of employment. There are more men in the service of the Government receiving high salaries, who are not rendering efficient and capable service for the salaries paid, for the reason that they have titles, than for any other reason. Men are carried on the rolls of the Government as chiefs of divisions who practically have no work to do as chiefs of divisions, but who are bookkeepers. There are men carried on the rolls of the Government as chief bookkeepers, who keep statistical indexes, or card indexes of some kind, and receive their pay because they have certain titles.

The basis of employment and pay of clerks in the Federal Government service should be fixed on the kind of work they do and the amount of work they have to do and their efficiency in performing their work. As far as I know, that has nothing to do with the Civil Service Committee. It may not directly relate to the question of appropriations, because the Committee on Appropriations is not supposed to be a committee which writes laws. It is a committee whose primary duty it is to appropriate money to carry out the laws which are on the statute books. But according to the precedents heretofore, this class of work has gone to the Appropriations Committees in both branches of the Congress.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. Is not the Senator mistaken in the statement that this class of work has gone to the Appropriations Committees in both branches of Congress? I call the Senator's attention to the course of the bills as they have been introduced. In the House, for example, the original bill, Senate bill 4106—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not talking about the issue now involved; I am talking about the past. Of course, there is an effort being made now, which I will come to in a moment, because I want the country to understand what is in this issue. I am not talking about how these bills should be referred. There is a lobby behind this question. I am talking about the practice for the past 30 or 40 years.

Although there may have been bills introduced and referred, I know of no bill in 40 years, since the civil-service rules were adopted and since the Civil Service Committees were created in the two branches of Congress, of which the Committee on Civil Service in either branch of Congress had jurisdiction, or which was reported and became law, changing the salaries of any Government employees. That is what I mean, and if I am mistaken I ask the Senator from South Dakota to point out where I am mistaken.

Mr. STERLING. I thought the Senator from Alabama referred to all bills that had been introduced of this or like nature, and I am able to refer him to three bills that have been introduced in the House in regard to reclassification, every one of which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, the issue is here now. Senators who believe the Civil Service Committee should have jurisdiction will vote to refer the bill to that committee. Those who think otherwise will ask that it be referred to the other committee. I am talking about precedent, and precedent is not established in the two Houses of Congress by the reference of bills. They go to committees as a matter of course. In the House of Representatives a bill is dropped in a box and it is automatically referred without action of the House.

Mr. STERLING. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to have him refer to a precedent of a like bill being referred in the first instance to the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee than the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that the very first action in reference to the classification of clerks' salaries originated in the Appropriations Committee. All bills and resolutions and amendments referring to the bonus proposition, which was a reclassification of salaries, were referred without objection to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STERLING. That was hardly a question of reclassification of salaries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It affected the salaries.

Mr. STERLING. It affected the salaries, that is true, but—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It affected every salary. It reclassified the salary of every Government employee who received a salary below \$2,500, and increased those salaries in the sum of \$240 a year. Does the Senator say that is so small, it is infinitesimal in his view compared with what should be done in this matter? If he did make that statement, I think he would alarm the men who will have to pay the taxes to carry on the Government.

Every change of existing salary in 40 years which has occurred in the Government has taken place on the report of the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses and has been reported to Congress on that basis. Now, the Senate in its recent action has come along and established a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that has jurisdiction of the question, just conferred within the last two weeks, and it now proposes to ignore that committee entirely.

We might as well recognize what this means. So far as I am concerned, I believe the employees composing the clerical force of the United States Government have an inadequate salary when we consider it in connection with the increased cost of living. The basis on which the salaries were established existed 40 years ago. I think it is safe to say that the purchasing power of the dollar to-day is only 50 cents as compared with the purchasing power of the dollar when these Government salaries were first established. We can not expect to have efficiency in Government unless we pay salaries that are sufficient to employ reasonably efficient men. I think one of the great costs in the running of the Government business is due to the very large number of inefficient employees who are now on the pay roll. I believe that if the question were properly and thoroughly looked into and properly handled, at least one-third of the clerks now employed in the great departments of the Government of the United States could be dispensed with, so far as their services are concerned. I believe their salaries could well be distributed to the remaining clerks and produce more efficiency in the management of Government affairs.

But we know perfectly well what the issue is. There are some people who are interested in the bill who think the Appropriations Committee are going to be too economical, are going to hold down appropriations too tightly, and they think that if the bill goes to the Committee on Civil Service they will get a larger basis of salary; in other words, if I may be permitted a vulgarism, they think the Committee on Appropriations are "tightwads" and the Committee on Civil Service will be extravagant. We know that perfectly well. We know that is exactly the shadow behind the whole thing, so far as reference of the bills may be concerned.

We know that every Senator here is having an unusual thing happen to him in that he is being "lobbied" on the question of the reference. Of course, we have been accustomed to meet lobbies on material issues, on questions where great principles are involved, but this question is a question of men. There is a lobby out here to carry the bills to one committee, and why? Because they think that committee will be more extravagant in handling the problem. That, in a nutshell, is all there is to it, and we may as well face the issue. If Senators wish to vote that way, that is their privilege. I have no objection in the world to the Senate registering its position on the question. I have no reflection on the members of either committee.

When the time comes to vote on the question of reference I shall vote to refer where I think the question can be best and most ably handled, but I am opposed to the pending proposition. In my judgment this is a foolish thing. It is an unusual thing. It is not a question of instructing a committee. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROOT] was right about that. This is no question of instruction. Here is the motion of the Senator from South Dakota:

That the reclassification bills be referred to the Committee on Civil Service for consideration and report to the Senate thereon, and that after such report they be referred to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and report on the matter of salaries, and that when so reported by both committees the bills shall come before the Senate upon the reports or recommendations of both committees as to salaries.

I do not say the Senate can not do this. Of course, the Senate can not take a bill and refer it to two committees at the same time, because the bill is a physical fact and has to go in

one direction at one time, and only one direction. It can go only to one committee, and whilst it is there it can not go to another committee. But the proposition offered is that we take the bills and refer them to the Committee on Civil Service, which can be done, and then, in advance of the action of the Committee on Civil Service, we shall proclaim that we doubt whether they are capable of properly reporting the bills back to the Senate, and so we say we are going to refer them to the Committee on Appropriations to make other recommendations as to salaries.

Let us see where we will find ourselves in that case. The Committee on Civil Service gets the bills. I do not suppose they will automatically report them back. I suppose the bills will receive consideration, and when they receive consideration they will probably have amendments. The committee will then report them back to the Senate, and as soon as the bills are in the Senate, without action on our part they will be sent down to the Committee on Appropriations to pass on all questions relating to salaries. Of course, that is all there is in the bills. The real issue involved here is the reclassification of the salaries of employees.

The Committee on Appropriations will then consider the bills. They can not amend the amendments of the Committee on Civil Service, but they can amend the bills, and they will then report the bills back with amendments of their own. I should like to know under those circumstances whose amendments will prevail. Whose amendments are going to have precedence in this charming arrangement, the arrangement of King Solomon to decide to whom the baby belongs by cutting it in two and giving half to each mother? That is about what Senators are trying to accomplish by this vote. They seek to avoid the responsibility of facing certain people who are clamorous to have their own way about the matter. The question is too big a question; it involves too much to the Government and the taxpayers of the United States to settle the issue in any such way.

There ought to be an increase in salaries. It ought to be adequate to support properly the Government employees. This is no time for extravagance; it is no time to run off and make undue charges on the Government. It is a time when some one committee of the Senate should take the responsibility that comes under these circumstances and bear it itself.

Of course, if it goes to a committee that is unsatisfactory to us, and that committee reports a measure back and we who are Members of the Senate are not satisfied, we can offer to amend. If it reports it back and its report is not satisfactory to the Senate in the aggregate, the Senate itself, as it has done many times before, instead of acting on the report of the committee that reported it, can recommit it to another committee; but when it does that then the responsibility for action on the bill will rest upon the committee to which it is recommitted and not with the committee that first reported it. When the two reports come in and we find that the class of \$900 clerks is increased by one committee to \$1,160 and by another committee to \$1,500, I should like to know which amendment will have the right of way and which will have precedence in the matter. How are we going to vote on it?

So far as limiting the Appropriations Committee to fixing salaries, the whole business is the fixing of salaries. Of course, in fixing salaries we have to designate the men to whom the salaries are going to be paid. You would have the Committee on Civil Service write out the designations and report the salary list back, and when the bill was sent down to the Appropriations Committee, if they thought they had a better method of classifying employees or of designating the method by which the salaries shall be paid, you say that the intelligence of the Appropriations Committee shall not operate on that question; that it shall operate only concerning the amount of salaries and that the intelligence of the Committee on Civil Service shall operate only on the classification.

Mr. President, I am opposed to this proposition. If the Republican Party want to demonstrate to the country that they are living up to what they claim for themselves and have always claimed for themselves—that they are efficient and capable of transacting the business of the country on a business-like basis—if they want to prove to the country that they are efficient, they had better defeat the pending motion; but if they want to prove their inefficiency and incapacity to handle a grave and a great question, in which all the taxpayers of the United States are interested to-day, then divide this responsibility; bring the matter back here to the Senate, it having been tied up in two committees for months, perhaps until after final adjournment of the session, with a divided verdict after the report, and insure thereby that no action will be taken in the near or immediate future.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.



Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For what purpose?

Mr. STERLING. I merely desire to submit in proper form the motion which I made awhile ago, and I am ready for a vote on it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from South Dakota may be ready for a vote but other Senators may not be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. STERLING. We can test the question in a moment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If a vote may be had upon the proposition of the Senator from South Dakota immediately without discussion, I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose, but if it provokes any discussion, I must object.

Mr. STERLING. I submit the motion which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The reading clerk read as follows:

That the bills introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR], relating to the classification and compensation of civil employees of the Government, be referred to the Committee on Civil Service for consideration and report to the Senate thereon; and that after such report such bills be then referred to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and report on the matter of salaries provided for in such bills; and that when so reported by both committees the bills shall come before the Senate upon the reports or recommendations of both committees as to salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] will be considered as read the second time and printed, and both bills will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### PROPOSED RECOGNITION OF IRELAND.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I now call up Senate joint resolution No. 1, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The reading clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) declaring that the independence of the republic of Ireland ought to be recognized by the Government of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. LA FOLLETTE April 12, 1921, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the independence of the republic of Ireland ought to be recognized by the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE addressed the Senate. After having spoken for 1 hour and 50 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. I was merely going to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] is now here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will go on, rather than permit another measure to be taken up.

Mr. KELLOGG. I shall be glad to give way at any time the Senator may request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Senate joint resolution No. 1 is now the business before the Senate, and I should like to go on until I conclude my remarks, and then ask to have the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should like it to be the business before the Senate, as it will not delay other business.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that we go into executive session now and resume to-morrow and thus give the Senator from Wisconsin full opportunity to conclude his remarks.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to that course. We may take a recess.

Mr. KING. After the executive session, let us take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That will be agreeable to me. Then I surrender the floor to the Senator from Massachusetts for the day, and I shall resume in the morning when the Senate meets on the expiration of the recess.

[See p. 637 for Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S speech.]

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 25 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25, 1921.*

##### ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Robert H. Lovett, of Illinois, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Frank Davis, jr., resigned.

##### ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Francis M. Goodwin, of Spokane, Wash., to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Selden G. Hopkins, resigned.

##### SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Theodore G. Risley, of Illinois, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor, vice Rowland B. Mahany, resigned.

##### SURVEYOR GENERAL OF IDAHO.

Virgil W. Samms, of Pocatello, Idaho, to be surveyor general of Idaho, vice Edward Hedden, term expired.

##### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Truman W. Bass, of Broken Bow, Nebr., to be register of the land office at Broken Bow, Nebr., vice Mack C. Warrington, term expired.

##### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONIES.

John Henry Bohling, of Miles City, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Miles City, Mont., vice John T. Hamilton, resigned.

##### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

###### ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

First Lieut. Merle Halsey Davis, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from September 2, 1919.

###### FIELD ARTILLERY.

Capt. Derrill de Saussure Trenholm, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25, 1921.*

##### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Louis A. Spellier, for the district of Nevada.

##### COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS.

Ethelbert Stewart to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

##### MEMBER OF FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Harry L. Fidler.

##### COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

Washington Gardner to be Commissioner of Pensions.

To be UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF PORTO RICO.

Arthur F. Odlin.

##### MEMBERS OF THE RAILROAD LABOR BOARD.

###### LABOR GROUP.

Walter L. McMenimen.

###### MANAGEMENT GROUP.

Samuel Higgins.

###### PUBLIC GROUP.

Ben W. Hooper.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, April 25, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.*

*Do Thou give direction and wisdom to all vital problems, and bestow upon us the sweet ministry of Thy love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 22, 1921, was read and approved.

## REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the address delivered by my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR] at the recent evacuation day ceremonies in Boston.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, that is rather ancient history, and I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

## COMMITTEE RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1921.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I herewith tender my resignation from the following committees of the House: Accounts; Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

CLAY STONE BRIGGS,  
Member of Congress, Seventh District of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 69.

Resolved, That Mr. CLAY STONE BRIGGS, of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional member of the Joint Committee on Reorganization.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 30, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to give us some time over here to discuss this resolution?

Mr. REAVIS. I have had it indicated to me that there is a desire for some time on the other side of the aisle. How will 15 minutes on a side do?

Mr. GARNER. I will say to the gentleman that I would like at least 20 minutes on this resolution, to explain it to the House before they vote on it, and I know the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNES] desires some time, and I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] desires some time, so that it will take at least an hour on this side to express our views concerning this resolution.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, with the naval appropriation bill now before the House and ready for consideration, I think an hour is more than the gentleman ought to request on a resolution of this kind.

Mr. GARNER. If I could have the entire 30 minutes on this side that would be sufficient so far as I am concerned, but these other gentlemen are going to want time, and I want at least 20 minutes myself.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, if he occupies 20 minutes himself, will not 10 minutes be sufficient for the other two gentlemen?

Mr. GARNER. That is for the gentlemen from Tennessee to say.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] demands the regular order. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object to the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama objects.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I ask what would be the proper reference of the resolution which has just been objected to?

The SPEAKER. The original resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Chair supposes this one will go to the same committee.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional member of the Joint Committee on Reorganization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 4803, and, pending that motion, I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] how much time is desired on that side.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What suggestion does the gentleman from Michigan make?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would suggest an hour and a half on a side.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This morning I thought there would be no requests from this side. Since that time I have received requests for about three hours and a half. I will ask for two hours and a half on this side.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to four hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and two hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to four hours, two hours to be controlled by himself and two hours by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, I had laid off to make a few remarks on this bill. My friend from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] says his time is all promised. Can the gentleman from Michigan yield to me a little time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BARKLEY. About 20 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I could not be quite so generous as that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can give the gentleman some of my time, and I think we can take care of him.

Mr. OLIVER. Why not make it 2 hours and 15 minutes on a side?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] that the time for general debate be limited to four hours, two hours to be controlled by himself and two hours by the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 4803, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is now before the House is exactly the same as that which was passed by the House at the last session. The bill went to the Senate about two weeks before the close of the session and was reported to the Senate, but did not pass that body, and so this is one of the two hang-over bills which this House is called upon to take care of.

I dare say that so far as the Members of the House are concerned who were also Members of the last Congress nothing need be said further than to say that the bill has been reported in exactly the same form and carrying exactly the same amounts as were agreed upon by the House at the last session. But for those who are Members of this Congress and were not in the last it may be advisable to make a short statement as to the policies underlying the bill.

The estimates submitted by the Navy Department were \$680,000,000. This bill carries \$396,000,000. So that there has been a reduction below the estimate of \$284,000,000. The appropriations for the Navy Department for the current year amount approximately to \$487,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.



Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman said the appropriations. The gentleman means, as I understand it, the regular appropriations and the deficiency.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I mean that all the revenue that was available for naval purposes during the current year amounted to \$487,000,000—the regular appropriation plus all deficiencies. So that this bill which is reported here is \$91,000,000 below the expenditures for the Navy Department for the current year.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Were these estimates submitted by the present Secretary of the Navy or by his department?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Under the law estimates are required to be submitted at a definite time, and that is at the beginning of the session preceding the July at which the appropriation is to be made available. So the Navy Department had no authority to submit to this Congress any new estimates, and the bill was prepared on the estimates submitted according to law last December.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman what the amount of the regular annual appropriation bill was?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Four hundred and thirty-three million dollars for the current year, which, of course, did not include the sums made necessary by the increased pay of the Navy, which was increased after the appropriation bill passed the House last year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That increase was passed on a deficiency bill, because the law was passed after the appropriation bill had been passed by the House?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As I understand, approximately \$487,000,000 is expended on the Navy this year, or on contracts to be carried out at the beginning of this year.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The appropriations for the current year altogether, regular and deficiency, amount to \$487,000,000, whereas this bill carries \$396,000,000, or \$91,000,000 less than the aggregate of the regular and deficiency appropriations of the current year.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, approximately \$500,000,000 will be expended this year on the Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Has not the reduction been largely due to the reduction of the personnel of the Navy and spreading out the building program over a series of years?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am going to explain how this reduction was accomplished.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How much of the \$487,000,000 was deficiency appropriation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Fifty-four million dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the present bill carries a larger sum than the regular appropriation bill for last year.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no; it is the difference between \$396,000,000 and \$433,000,000 carried in the last bill in favor of this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is the gentleman from Michigan certain that \$487,000,000 will take care of all the activities of the Navy for the current year and that we will not have a deficiency before the 1st of July?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course, I can not guarantee that there will be no further deficiencies.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Were any new hearings had on this matter?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There were no new hearings had by the Committee on Appropriations. There appeared to be nothing new that required hearings. The condition of the Navy and the conditions of the country and the conditions of the world did not seem to have materially changed since we passed the bill in the House last March.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Referring to the matter of deficiency, I understand it was something like \$53,000,000. What is the policy of the committee with reference to permitting the department to incur deficiencies in such enormous amounts?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. As to the chief items which made up the deficiencies for this year the administrative branch of the Government was in no way at fault because the appropriation bill which passed last year did not carry the increased pay for the Navy which was provided by a special act later on. We increased the pay of the ordinary seamen, of the skilled mechanics, and of the lower grade of officers for a period of two years. So that excess over the ordinary pay provided by law had to be carried as a deficiency, and that accounts for the major portion of the sum named.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman says that the amount appropriated in this bill is the same as that included in the bill at the last session of Congress. May I ask the gentleman if the lump-sum appropriations here are contemplated to be expended for the same purposes and along the same lines practically as the former bill?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, judging the future by the past, is the gentleman able to foresee whether this appropriation will probably have to be augmented by another deficiency bill for next year?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In preparing this bill we fixed the amounts at a figure which we did not believe would require further sums to be expended. Whether or not our judgment will be borne out by experience nobody can fully say. For instance, we fixed the cost of the ration for the men at 50 cents in this bill. The present cost of the ration is much above that. In ordinary years, before the war, the cost of ration was much below this. We fixed the amount at a figure which we thought probably prices would justify following the 1st of July. Of course, we might make a mistake. The ration is fixed by law. The statute states exactly the weight and quantity of food, the different kinds of foods which must be supplied to the Navy, and the Navy Department has no leeway in supplying that food. If we have made a lower estimate of price of food than the market will warrant, of course, they would be entitled to come in with a deficiency for the difference, but we believe that every sum carried in the bill is sufficient, if economically administered, to take care of the needs of the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the gentleman able to say, offhand, what has been the average amount of deficiency appropriations for the Navy each year for the last five years, making due allowances for war emergencies?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; I can not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am speaking about normal times.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I can not give the gentleman that information.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is it not a fact that under the law the Navy Department can create a deficiency or spend any amount of money it wants, no matter what the policy of Congress is or what the desire of Congress is with reference to expenditures? The item of rations is one of them.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman has made the statement a little broader than it should be made. There are certain deficiencies which the Navy Department may legally incur. One of them, of course, is the matter of food, because the law prescribes the kind and quantity of the ration, and if Congress does not provide enough money to buy that much food, of that particular kind, the Navy Department is authorized to create a deficiency in order to feed the men in the Navy, which policy, of course, no one would question.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is it not true also with reference to fuel? The Navy Department, one year I know, made an estimate of \$10,000,000 for fuel, whereas they expended four or five times that amount.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; fuel is another item. There may be some question as to the advisability of permitting deficiencies in some lines where they are permitted now to be made. I am inclined to think that perhaps it will be necessary to permit deficiencies in respect to fuel. No one can say with definiteness at any time what fuel is going to cost or exactly how much steaming should be done. The ships, of course, must be kept supplied with the necessary amount of fuel, and yet sometimes I have been strongly of the opinion that the department having charge of the operation of the fleet wholly ignored the amount of money it has had for that purpose. In my judgment the time will come, unless every bureau of the Government takes into account with great strictness the amount of money that has been appropriated for a particular purpose and keeps within that amount, when it will be necessary for Con-

gress to put the screws on pretty tight and prevent these supplemental appropriations.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Can the gentleman inform us approximately what amount of money of these appropriations will be used in Government navy yards and how much in privately owned yards?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The amount of money carried under the Bureau of Construction and Repair and Steam Engineering I think amounts to something like \$40,000,000. That is for repairs. I think practically all of that or nearly all of that will be expended in the navy yards. So far as the new construction is concerned, some of the ships are contracted for in private yards and some are being built in the navy yards. Just how much money will be expended upon those being constructed in the navy yards depends upon how rapidly the Navy Department thinks it advisable to push the work and also upon what its contract obligations may be in yards operated by private companies. It is a matter of administration about which I would not be able to advise the gentleman. I doubt very much whether the department itself at this time could tell exactly how much money it intends to apply on each particular ship under construction.

Mr. HULL. In each bill passed in the last two or three years we had a provision directing or compelling the department to spend the money in the navy yards provided it could do it economically—for less amount than they could buy the material outside. Has any member of the committee informed himself as to whether that requirement is being carried out in the Navy Department?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I hope so, because they certainly are employing a tremendous force of men in the navy yards—between 50,000 and 60,000 mechanics are employed in the several yards and stations.

Mr. HULL. I am reliably informed that recently they have let contracts to private yards when the price fixed by the navy yards was considerably less than that fixed by the private corporations. Is that true?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not know about that.

Mr. HULL. Would it not be a good idea for some member of the committee to find out if that provision is being carried out?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I suggest that the gentleman from Iowa specify what contracts have been let under the conditions he states.

Mr. HULL. I am not informed as to the exact contract, but I can find out. I have been informed by high officers in the Navy Department that they have paid no attention to that provision.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It may be that other considerations have intervened. If the navy yards could not supply the product within the time required by the Government, quite naturally they would let the contract on the outside; but I do not think that the navy yards have been discriminated against in this particular.

My own opinion is that there ought to be a tremendous reduction in the number of men employed in navy yards. I know very well that the men employed there will importune their friends in Congress and everywhere else to see to it that every kind of work that is possibly available for navy yards be sent there in order that employment may be continued. Before the war we had in all these navy yards and stations about 25,000 or 30,000 men, and the last time I inquired into it there were something like 60,000 mechanics in these navy yards and stations, drawing the very top market in wages, and my impression is that these navy yard rolls should be much smaller.

There are old ships of every kind and description tied up at these navy yards and constantly the department is solicited to repair those ships, put millions of dollars, I do not know how much money they could spend, but more than is in this bill, simply for the repair of old ships, which, in the end, probably we will never use a single day. The greatest economy that this Government could effect, so far as the Navy is concerned, would be to make a complete survey of all the craft we have and send the obsolete ships to the bottom of the sea or sell them for scrap instead of trying to continue navy-yard employment repairing old craft that will be utterly useless perhaps when they are repaired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. In that connection, I notice an item in this bill involving \$22,500,000, page 29, in order to furnish equipment in the way of rugs, curtains, carpets, etc. This morning—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not think the Navy Department buys any rugs. I have not heard of it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. This morning I was informed by an admiral in the Navy that application had been made to take off these 10 German vessels some of the equipment even for souvenirs, and he made the statement that he was of the opinion that it would be necessary to sink those ships, equipment and all. In other words, we could not salvage a knife and fork, a piece of table linen, a book, or anything of the kind on one of those ships, and, inasmuch as the gentleman is chairman of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over this subject, I would like to know if he has examined into the treaty to know whether or not it is necessary to destroy property which could be put to use in other branches of the Navy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am not familiar with the treaty regarding the disposition of those ships, but I will say that the sum mentioned by the gentleman, \$22,500,000—

Mr. McCLINTIC. I thought possibly we might use a knife, or fork, or silverware, or table linen, or floor mops, or use some other things on those ships to very good advantage and save some of the money for the country instead of sending them to the bottom of the sea.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The \$22,500,000 the gentleman mentioned is for the repair of the ships of the active fleet and the payment of all expenses of essential work done in the navy yards, and that amount has been cut below the estimate and below the amount asked for by the department about \$8,000,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. In your hearings on this proposition did the gentleman investigate as to the efficiency of these 75,000 employees in the employ of the country?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course, the gentleman will understand that that would be quite a contract, to investigate the efficiency of the work done in these navy yards or any other branch of the Government, and I have made no personal investigation of that; but, of course, that is a matter of administration and I sincerely hope that the navy yards will be so administered as to get the very highest degree of efficiency.

Mr. McKENZIE. My reason for asking that question, if the gentleman will pardon me just a moment, is that one officer of the Navy testified before a committee of which I happened to be chairman that during the war the efficiency in the navy yards was about 33½ per cent. This was about 18 months ago, and he said it was not very much better then; at any rate, it was not up to the standard. The point I am trying to get at is whether the committee investigated from officers in the Navy as to the efficiency of the employees in these navy yards, and whether or not they rendered to this Government a day's work for a day's pay. Furthermore, I would like to ask the gentleman what was the estimate made by the officers in the Navy for this particular service and how much the committee cut it down?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, as I say, the two items in the bill which support the navy yards, three items really, are items under the Bureau of Construction and Repair, which, as I recall, is \$22,500,000; the Bureau of Steam Engineering, which is \$20,500,000; the Bureau of Ordnance, which runs the gun factory down here, amounting to about \$14,000,000, so you have about \$57,000,000 which will be available for the payment of wages in navy yards and stations.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. I see in the report for 1920, in round numbers, that the amount appropriated is \$486,000,000. For the year 1922 there is, in round numbers, \$396,000,000. That means a saving or a reduction of about \$90,000,000. Has the gentleman anything in his bill that will guarantee that this sum of \$396,000,000 is not going to be increased through deficiency bills? Is there any check—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, the gentleman will realize that deficiencies are incurred under provisions of law. That is to say, they are incurred where the law permits them to be incurred, and as I stated before the gentleman came in awhile ago, undoubtedly the time would come, unless the greatest caution were exercised by the various departments against incurring deficiencies, that Congress would be justified—

Mr. LAYTON. I heard during the last Congress time and time again that the Republicans of this body were going to stop this practice of allowing the departments to exceed expenditures.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course, the gentleman will realize that that is a matter of legislation.

Mr. LAYTON. And I think it is time to do so.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Committee on Appropriations would not have jurisdiction, but with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] having charge of all legislative matters



as the honored chairman of the Naval Committee, I feel that it will be taken care of, if further restrictions are deemed necessary.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman what the deficiencies before his committee for the Navy Department amount to?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, it is the difference between \$433,000,000, which the bill carried the current year, and \$487,000,000, which is the total for the Navy, including all deficiencies, or \$54,000,000.

We are in great danger of wasting time by reason of the fact that gentlemen were not in the House at the beginning of this discussion and did not know that we had discussed all this quite fully before.

Mr. BUTLER. How did I get the figure in my mind of something like \$130,000,000 of deficiencies?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They amount to about \$54,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. You know that we were asked to legislate in order to enable the department to take care of those figures.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, what the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON] meant was that there ought to be some legislation which would prevent the incurring of deficiencies, and I answered him that the Committee on Appropriations would not have jurisdiction over that subject.

Mr. BUTLER. Very effective; withhold the appropriation.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in answering the question the chairman has stated that the intention of the committee was to reduce the working force in the Navy, and are now doing it. Has the committee taken into consideration the fact that there are just as many officers now assigned to the several yards? And is it not a fact that the wages that are paid to these officers are taken out of the maintenance of the navy yards and the building up of their work?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman is wrong about the paying of the officers. The officers' pay is provided under the pay of the Navy and does not come out of these working funds.

Mr. TAGUE. But it is a fact that in the operation of the navy yards a certain percentage of the wage of the officer is charged to the overhead work, and that is done in every navy yard in this country.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. As a matter of bookkeeping, in order to determine what a job would cost, I think that is true, but as a matter of paying bills it is not true. It is necessary to determine sometimes what a thing in a navy yard costs, and when they do that it is necessary to charge up to the construction the proportionate part of the pay of the officers who are assigned to that work, but the pay does not come out of that appropriation.

Mr. TAGUE. Should the efficiency of the yard be charged with the salary of the officers? For instance, in the Boston Navy Yard, with 3,500 mechanics at work, there are 155 officers, and their wage is being charged to the work they are performing.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In a sense, I say, it is charged on the books, but it is not taken out of any of the funds assigned to that yard.

Mr. TAGUE. But it does increase the cost of the work being done by the navy yards as compared with outside work?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am glad to hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts, who lives near the Boston Yard, relative to conditions in that yard. His information as to that yard is generally very accurate, and I am sure that the information will not go astray.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not necessary that these amounts that are paid to officers in the yards should be charged as against the operation of the yards, for the purpose of determining whether or not we could make a battleship in a United States navy yard cheaper than it can be made in a private yard? Otherwise it would be impossible to determine what was the cost of the vessel.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is not exactly right, for this reason, that a lot of officers must be employed as a part of the standing organization of the Navy. You are not justified in charging all of that to the expense of construction, because the Government must maintain that establishment anyhow. The trouble in the competition between the United States navy yards

and the private builders is that all the force of the officers is charged against the work itself, and it ought not to be so.

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true; but notwithstanding that it should be charged, in order to understand what the vessel costs.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If a navy yard submits a bid in competition with a private firm, the navy yard does not have to keep within its bid. If it takes a contract and it is found that it has bid too low, the Navy Department has to pay more to finish up the job. But as a means of determining what their cost ought to be, of course all the natural and the legitimate overhead that would be charged in any enterprise will be charged in the navy yard. That is, it should be charged.

Mr. TOWNER. But, as a matter of fact, of course, those things would be paid for in any event?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But the pay of these men does not come out of the appropriation for the navy yard, but does come out of the appropriation for pay of the Navy.

Mr. TOWNER. If an officer is in the navy yard, he gets his pay. He gets it whether he is in the navy yard or on the sea?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Surely. He is assigned to that work.

Mr. LINEBERGER. If the gentleman will yield to me, I would like to ask him if the practice of cost plus a percentage has been discontinued? Is work being done in the outside concerns on a basis of cost plus a fixed sum?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So far as the cost-plus arrangements are concerned, they were made for these large ships, and those were cost-plus and a fixed sum.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Then, I understand the cost-plus percentage as established during the war has been absolutely discontinued?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So far as I know, there are no such contracts. I do not think the Navy had them to a great extent, but if they did they have been changed. And whereas originally that might have operated against us, and is, generally speaking, a bad sort of contract, yet with the falling prices of labor and material in the construction of these great ships that are now under consideration there will be, as the result of that contract, a material saving to the Government running into a good many millions.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is it not a notorious fact that on both coasts during the war a great many ships were constructed on that basis and that the cost ran up to several times what it should have been?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is not any doubt but that it is susceptible of great abuse.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I read from page 3 of your report, "All the vessels in the private yards are being constructed on the basis of actual cost plus a fixed sum."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. That is what I just stated to the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER].

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman kindly explain to us the basis or substance of that contract and the facts, so that we can know how they operate?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I intended to take that up later, in connection with the building program, but I can answer it now.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Let me answer this first, and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. By the way, Mr. Chairman, how much time have I already consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 38 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I shall have to go along rapidly. The fee, as I recollect, in these large contracts for ships, which would aggregate a cost of \$30,000,000, say, is \$2,000,000. That is my recollection. I may be slightly in error, but it is not an exorbitant fee at all; 7 per cent of \$30,000,000. That is a tremendous contract to undertake, and very few people would give up their establishment for the construction of Government work for a smaller profit than 7 per cent of the contract price.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Now, as to 7 per cent of the actual cost, how do you know how much the Government is paying for the material?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Government purchases the material, and where it does not purchase it, it has plenty of inspectors and officers to keep close check on costs; perhaps not too many, but certainly there is no fault through lack of inspection or in ascertaining how the work is being carried forward, or the cost of the work.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. How much are these newest of our modern battleships costing?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is almost impossible to answer the question with any degree of accuracy, because they are being built on a cost-plus, a fixed-fee basis.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is there not an estimate of that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The first estimate for the program was something like \$500,000,000. That was in 1916.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is the 1916 program?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; and with the increased cost of labor and materials the later estimates were fixed at something like \$950,000,000, and now with the scale going the other way, I would not be surprised to see it run \$850,000,000, making the cost of dreadnaughts something like \$34,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The bill carries about twenty-three and one-half million dollars for aviation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Directly and indirectly; yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman, does that mean for heavier-than-air or all kinds?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. All kinds.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is my recollection that the Government has spent within the last two years almost a million dollars in investigating the construction of the lighter-than-air craft in Europe. I believe the Navy Department maintained a man at Bremerhaven, Germany, for about a year, and the plans and specifications were drawn up for construction at Lakehurst, N. J., of a dirigible of the latest model pattern, of the newest and latest line. Will that \$1,000,000 go to waste or will they find some way to utilize it? If they are not going to build any more lighter-than-air craft and this bill does not provide for the construction of any lighter-than-air craft, of course that money will be lost, will it not?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We thought the best way to make sure of that was not to put it in the bill. There is nothing carried in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is contemplated not to take it up and carry it on?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is a very difficult matter. There was a sum of money appropriated to build one dirigible and to buy one. We bought one in England, and they expect to bring that over here soon. The Committee on Appropriations in considering the question of spending the other million thought we might as well wait until the one we bought from England was delivered and experiments had been made with that to see what changes, if any, should be made in the plans for the one that we intended to build. It seemed like a reasonable program to pursue, especially in view of the fact that there is a wide difference of opinion as to the value of the dirigible in the matter of warfare.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has not the value of the dirigible been demonstrated as a war machine?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In some degree; but I understand the British Government has discontinued them altogether.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from Michigan, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Briggs], estimated that the present cost of these large dreadnaughts was \$34,000,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That did not include the sum total of equipment and armament?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; everything.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BENHAM. Can the gentleman tell us whether, since this matter was last before the House, there has been any further experimentation to test the vulnerability of battleships from the air?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Nothing yet. They are arranging a test, to take place in June.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS. In the proving station at Dahlgren, across from Indianhead, where does the money come from?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The only money that is available for the Ordnance Department comes out of the \$14,000,000 carried for the use of that department. I think the Ordnance Department is in a little different situation as to the interchange of funds from any other department. There is a provi-

sion that has been carried, if I am not mistaken—and the chairman of the Naval Committee will probably bear me out in it, or correct me if I am wrong—there is a provision of law which permits all the funds appropriated for ordnance to be considered in the end as one fund. Although they use the money as nearly as they can for the purpose for which it is appropriated, yet in the end, if they are short in one and have a balance in another, they can make the interchange. I imagine that possibly, if there is no special appropriation for the proving ground that the gentleman speaks of, they might use an unexpended balance of some other fund for that purpose.

Mr. STEPHENS. Has the gentleman any information in regard to the building of the home for the commandant at that station in a way that will cost between \$100,000 and \$150,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; I have not. Where is that?

Mr. STEPHENS. At Dahlgren, right across from Indianhead. And is there any information that they are tearing down some \$4,000 bungalows at Indianhead in order to get a hundred dollars' worth of lumber for the building over at Dahlgren?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am sure from the gentleman's questions that he has more information about Dahlgren than I have.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that the question of a deficit seems to me to be one of the utmost importance. I want to see if I correctly understood the gentleman's explanation of that. The department submitted an estimate, and your committee took it in charge, and then took the testimony of the officers who had submitted the estimate and other witnesses, and cut the appropriation away below what these men recommended.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is done very often, and has been done here.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Very frequently, as I notice from the bill and the report. Now that being true, I understood the gentleman to say that you gave these officers the power, where Congress does not appropriate in their judgment a sufficient amount, to expend what they please.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The law gives them that power in a very restricted sense, only for such things as food and coal for the ships, some very essential and necessary things for the operation of the Navy. That is not general. That is the exception.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I know, but you did not limit the amount, or restrict them to any figure.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Why not?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If you did you would only be making a sort of supplemental appropriation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, if it was the money of a private corporation, does the gentleman think they would allow any subordinate, in time of peace especially, in his discretion, to buy as much food or as much coal as he wanted to at any figure?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am inclined to think not, but—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, wait a minute.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But that is the law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I know it is the law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Which, of course, the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction over.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am bringing out what I think is a very important thing in connection with this bill. That method of procedure has resulted in a deficit in this bill of over \$50,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; that is not quite correct.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How many million dollars?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The amount of the deficit is \$54,000,000; but, as I stated in the beginning—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How much of that is for coal and food?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. None of it is for food.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How much is for coal?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Quite a good deal of it is for coal. But the Congress, after the appropriation bill was presented to the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Butler] last year, passed a bill increasing the pay of the officers below a certain grade and of the men in the Navy, because the skilled mechanics were all getting away. That apparently had to be done. The appropriation bill passed the House before the legislation that I speak of was enacted, and that accounts for some \$30,000,000 of the deficit.

Now, another deficiency was for coal, about which I have found more fault, I think, than the gentleman from Wisconsin will be able to find. They asked the Secretary of the Navy for



a large sum for coal last year. The Secretary of the Navy took the matter under consideration, and discovered that the highest amount they ever expended for coal before the war was about \$6,000,000, and he, in his judgment, thought that if he gave them \$10,000,000 after the war that was enough. They wanted some \$27,000,000 or \$28,000,000, and I do not know but more. The committee passed the bill carrying \$10,000,000 for that purpose. Since that time they have brought in two deficiencies, one for \$20,000,000 and one for \$6,000,000, making \$36,000,000 for fuel last year, an utterly ridiculous sum of money for that purpose, in my judgment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion in that connection?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If a man in the Navy Department wanted to be permitted to buy coal ad libitum, he would submit an inadequate estimate of \$10,000,000, a too low figure, and that the committee would say to him, "If you can not buy all the coal you want for that figure, then buy as much as you want at any figure." That is the situation here—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; they are never backward about asking for the full amount. The gentleman is wrong in that respect.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is the exact situation, that you allow them to buy coal in such quantities as they think necessary, at any figure they feel obliged to pay.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Navy Department made a very good bargain as to the price of coal. They purchased coal at a very much lower figure than one would expect, because they actually commandeered it. They took it and fixed the price themselves, so there is no criticism of the Navy Department about the price; but I agree with the gentleman that the amount of fuel that they used was excessive.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Do you not permit the officers to buy in their discretion both as to amount and as to price?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no, indeed. Contracts are awarded to the lowest bidder. There is no question about the price.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But you allow them to decide how much they will use.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course, the executive branches of the Government have to perform the ministerial functions. Congress could not fix the price of coal or direct the movement of ships.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No; but it could put a maximum amount beyond which the Public Treasury should not be obliged to pay.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That would not be a bad idea.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But I want to make it perfectly clear that the Committee on Appropriations has no legislative jurisdiction of any kind, and the existing law permits the Navy Department to incur deficiencies for fuel. So that if the correction is to be had it can not come through this bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How much of this appropriation called for in this bill is a lump sum?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Nearly all of it in lump sums—here is the pay of the Navy, \$120,000,000 or \$130,000,000; we can not enumerate the officers—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The salaries of the officers—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Are fixed by law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is not strictly a lump sum; that is a definite sum to be computed by the law itself. But frequently there are lump-sum appropriations made for various departments in which the amount to be expended is left to the discretion of executive officers.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not see how that could be avoided. You have 100 ships to be kept in repair, and can the gentleman tell how much it will take for each ship?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not at all.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. You do not know what repairs are going to be needed; you do not know what engine is to give out; you do not know what ship will lose its rudder; you can not see into the future but you can make an average. You have got to trust to somebody to expend the money honestly and judiciously. The amount is based on past experience.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is a good witness, no doubt about that, and if he will pardon the expression he has been there before. But what I wanted to get at is, ought not Congress fix a maximum amount beyond which the executive officer can not spend the public funds?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is true in almost every case, but there are two or three cases which I have suggested where

a leeway is given. If it is desired to enact such a law the proper procedure is to have the legislative committee, the Naval Committee, bring in legislation to that effect.

Mr. OSBORNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. OSBORNE. Will the gentleman inform the House as to what provision is made in this bill to facilitate the work of the Navy in the Pacific Ocean?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will come to that very shortly, if I am permitted to go forward.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will, and then I must proceed.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman made two statements with reference to a remedy for deficiencies, and then he said that the Appropriations Committee's hands were tied; and again he said if this thing was not stopped something would have to be done in the way of putting the screws on them. Will the gentleman explain what he meant by a remedy and putting on the screws?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman from Wisconsin is an old Member of the House who has just come back in this session, and is perfectly familiar with the procedure of the House. The rules of the House have been modified somewhat since he was a former Member, and now the Appropriations Committee makes all appropriations but has absolutely no power in the world to change any existing law; that function is reserved for the legislative committees having charge of the departments under consideration. So that if there is to be further change of law for the Navy it would be for the Naval Committee and not for the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations has not and will not assume any jurisdiction that we are not given under the rules; that is, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman said something would have to be done or put on the screws. I know the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction, but what are the screws that the gentleman referred to?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, I do not think it would be profitable for me to discuss legislative provisions.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not this true; it is our duty to provide definite specific sums of appropriations and to keep the executive departments within the sums appropriated, and we do that as far as we can. Is it not also true that when we come to defense estimates of the country, estimates on which the safety of the country depends, Congress has also felt that in certain lines there must be a little more latitude of authority and discretion than with regard to the civil establishment? Congress has assumed to say how many pounds the ration shall consist of and of what it shall consist. That being true, if we do not appropriate enough to buy the rations on the basis of congressional appropriation, of course there is a deficiency, and it can not be avoided without reducing the amount of the ration which Congress has fixed.

As far as coal is concerned, we can not say what activities should be had in the Navy in any given year. If a considerable increased force in the Navy shall, in the judgment of the Executive, be sent to the Pacific in the near future, it will somewhat increase the consumption of fuel above what would otherwise be required, and thereby something of a deficiency be made. While it is entirely proper for the committee to consider all these matters, we all realize that as a defense estimate we must give them a little more discretion relative to certain essential expenditures, if there be an emergency, within the discretion of the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has used one hour.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wyoming a question.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I shall have to decline to yield. I am very sorry to say that I think I shall have to suspend entirely at this point, because I have promised the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] 30 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I suggest, if the gentleman is desirous of yielding and if he does not care to proceed at this time, he take further time as the debate proceeds. But, Mr. Chairman, except for the time that has been allotted to the gentleman from Ohio, I think the House would be very glad to have the gentleman from Michigan use the balance of the time.

The gentleman was kind enough to allot me 10 minutes. I would be very glad to have him use that time, and I suppose other gentlemen will be willing to forego their desire to join in the general debate.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is very generous, but I do not think I shall do that. I have consumed an hour of time. There is but one hour left on this side. I have yielded 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and others, including the majority leader, have been promised time.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I should not presume that the time promised to myself could be as well used as it could by the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, and I should be inclined to waive any rights that I might have in regard to the assignment of time and yield it to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am not entirely free from embarrassment, and yet I would like to do what the committee desires me to do. There are some items that I think I ought to discuss. I would say this, that the utmost liberality, so far as the building program is concerned, will be permitted when we reach that paragraph under the five-minute rule, so that if there are those who want to discuss that at some length and they are willing to wait until the item is reached under the five-minute rule, I can assure them that the rule will not be strictly enforced.

I am going to ask the committee, now, to permit me to proceed without interruption. The bill that we have presented carrying \$396,000,000 has been drawn with several policies in mind. I do not believe that it can be materially reduced below the amount carried in the bill, if those policies are permitted to control.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I must decline to yield. We have drawn the bill upon the theory that there would be a reduction in the personnel from the present number of about 120,000 men, the number appropriated for last year, and which will be the average for the current year, to 100,000, a reduction of 20,000 men. The number in the Marine Corps will remain at 20,000 men, the same as this year. The authorized strength of the Navy is 143,000 men and the authorized strength of the Marine Corps 27,500 men. We have reduced the appropriation, as I say, to an amount sufficient to pay for 100,000 men in the Navy and 20,000 men in the Marine Corps. We have done that upon the theory that 100,000 men will keep in commission, outside of a large number of destroyers which were built during the war for a special need, all the newest and best equipment of the Navy. We can keep 17 dreadnaughts in commission. That represents the entire list of dreadnaughts. We have some twenty-odd battleships of an older type built prior to the dreadnaughts, which will have to be tied up with simply enough men on board to prevent deterioration.

During the war we built about 300 destroyers. The 1916 program contemplated about 50 in addition to those we had, so that we probably have an excess of destroyers of some 200. It is not necessary to keep all those in full commission. We have provided for keeping in commission 100 of them. We have provided for keeping in commission practically all of the available submarines, so that it may be stated that 100,000 men, in the judgment of the committee, will keep all of the fighting craft in commission that have been constructed since the old battleship program ended. That means something like 25,000 men in the Atlantic Fleet and a similar number in the Pacific Fleet, in all 50,000 men in the two fleets. The other 50,000 men, it seems to the committee, will be perfectly ample to take care of aviation; the number of men necessary to be kept training provide the necessary men for special duty at sea and all of the shore stations and to provide such men as are necessary to preserve in good condition the ships not to be kept in full commission.

The Navy Department has resisted this reduction with a good deal of force, and the Naval Committee of another body increased the number provided by the House last March to 120,000 men, but in the judgment of the committee 100,000 men ought to be ample for all of our needs at the present time, especially in view of the fact that with a navy 60 per cent larger than ours Great Britain has but 120,000 officers and men. She probably has not more than 105,000 men in her navy, with all of her far-flung Empire to protect. Japan has something like 65,000 to 70,000 men in her navy. We believe that 100,000 men for our Navy would be a reasonable reduction at this time, when economies are so absolutely necessary to be effected, and it can be done without jeopardizing the defense of the country. That one item accounts for a large part of the reductions below the current bill.

Another item is the matter of new construction. The 1916 program provides for the building of 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, and a large number of other craft. We have already appropriated for that program upward of

\$500,000,000. Under the old estimates there would be left about \$450,000,000, but with falling prices and falling costs it is fair to assume that it can be finished for probably \$360,000,000. The Navy Department asked for \$180,000,000 this year with the idea of finishing the program in two years more. But the committee did not see that there was any special reason why every one of these ships should be completed within two years. Instead of giving the \$180,000,000, we have spread the work over a period of four years and carry in the bill the sum of \$90,000,000 for the continuation of the construction of these ships. That does not mean that the whole program will be deferred for four years. Some of these ships are almost finished. The *Colorado* was launched the other day, and that will be finished in the course of a few months. The *Maryland* will be coming along very shortly, and so month by month various ships now in various stages of completion will be brought into the Navy, and all within four years. When we get that full program finished America will have, in the judgment of those who are best qualified to speak, I think, a navy equal in fighting strength to any other navy in the world. [Applause.]

A question has arisen as to the wisdom of completing this program. Shall we cancel any part of it or all of it? The committee gave a good deal of consideration to the question of cancellation, and we came to the conclusion that the program, taken as a whole, would require as much money to be appropriated to cancel it as to finish it. If you put up an office building until you have 50 per cent of your total investment in the building and have your material all ordered, and much of it actually fabricated, everything contracted for that goes into the building, and then all at once stop the work, tear down what you have put up, go out and cancel and settle up all of your contracts back to the last man, you will spend about as much money as you would to go ahead and finish the building, and then have nothing to show for your expenditure.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In a moment. What I have said is not true probably as to each of the ships, but as to the program as a whole it would undoubtedly be true. Cancellation of those not far advanced, of course, would not involve such heavy losses. The real difficulty, however, about canceling those that are the least advanced is that in most cases those that are the least advanced are the ships that we need the most.

And you ask how could that be? Why did they not go ahead and build most rapidly the ships we needed the most? They are the battle-cruiser type, powerful ships of great displacement, carrying eight 16-inch guns, with a speed of 35 knots, no ship in the world like them, nothing afloat of that size or tonnage or that gun power—16-inch guns.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is mistaken in their being 44,000 tons displacement; it is 42,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Very well. We have none of this type of ship. After the war was over the experts of the Navy took practically a year to revise the plans for these ships. Changes were made in the light of what had happened during the war. The plans for these battle cruisers were largely made over, and that delayed the construction of them for at least a year, and it so happens now that the battle cruisers, these six great ships, are the least advanced of any on this program, and they are the ships that we need the most, because other nations have them and we have none.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How long will it take to complete them?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It will take three or four years to finish them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will there be anything in advance of them before that time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. You can not put a muffer upon the genius of America. There will be changes, of course.

Mr. BRIGGS rose.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is no doubt of that. I am sorry I can not yield, but I have been pretty generous, and I want to finish what I am saying. Now, from the standpoint of economy, from the standpoint of saving money, there is little if any to be saved by canceling this 1916 program, because you have either to appropriate money to finish the ships or you have to appropriate money to settle the cancellations and in the end have no ships. So it does not take very much economic wisdom or statesmanship to decide which course should be pursued in reference to the program as a whole. Now, some of the battleships are not far advanced, and it is urged that they might be canceled. The situation as to them is almost the same as in the case of the battle cruisers. The most powerful battleships are the least advanced, and have been delayed for the same reason as the cruisers, in order to have the very last word in battleship construction as far as there



is a possibility of having a last word. Some of the battleships carry only eight 16-inch guns. Those are the ones that are farthest advanced. Those least advanced carry twelve 13-inch guns.

Mr. PADGETT. That is, the battle cruisers to carry 12?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; the battleships that are farthest advanced. Those least advanced carry twelve 16-inch and the battleships that are the least advanced carry twelve 16-inch guns or 50 per cent greater gun power. Am I right?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So that whether you consider battleships or battle cruisers, the most powerful ships are the least advanced, and for the reasons which I have stated. Now let us look at the proposition from the standpoint of reduction of armament. Every patriotic citizen is soundly impressed with the necessity of lifting this tremendous load of military equipment from the shoulders of the world. It certainly should be lifted [applause] and America ought to play her part in helping to lift it. Fortunately, in my judgment, this program will contribute mightily to that end. Why? Because it puts us in a position where we can offer to the world a proposition of proportional reduction in naval establishments. With this program completed we can enter into an agreement to effect a reduction in naval strength throughout the world of 25 per cent or 35 per cent or 40 per cent without danger to our national defense, because our relative strength will not diminish, and because when the reduction is made we will still be the equal of any nation in the world in sea power.

And that is the only way we can get a reduction of armament. The reduction will begin by scrapping old weapons. Nobody would be foolish enough to reduce armament by scrapping his latest weapon. We have old ships by the hundred, the upkeep of which is tremendous. Let there be a reduction of armament; there never will be disarmament; we ourselves undoubtedly never would consent to complete disarmament. I can not too strongly stress the point that reduction of armament to be acceptable to us must be on the basis of equality on the sea with any other power. That will make for peace. When America and the great English-speaking Empire—the British Empire—can go out upon the seas of the world as equals, recognize each other as equals, there will be no disagreement which intelligent statesmanship can not amicably adjust. [Applause.] And so, whether we look at it one way or the other, whether we have reduction of armament or not, I can not see any escape from completing this program, if we are wise and if we are to play the part in shaping the future of the world that events and Providence has put upon us.

America has many responsibilities these days. Nations abroad have been completely wrecked. Others are trembling from the onslaughts of anarchy and are honeycombed with pernicious doctrines subversive of great principles which we had supposed were acknowledged as sound throughout the world. America may ultimately be the last trench in which the friends of civilization may be able to hold what we have won in a struggle of a thousand years. One of the corner stones of our civilization is the doctrine of private property and the right of a man to enjoy the fruits of his toil. We supposed this was settled, but now find that this doctrine, which is the basis of our civilization, is challenged by millions of people. America must hold steady if the civilization of mankind, so dearly bought, is to be preserved for our children and those who are to come after them. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure the distinguished gentleman sincerely believes in his position, but if we propose disarmament, which, if accepted, would leave us the naval superior of any other power in the world—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Would the gentleman propose a policy which would make us inferior to any other power in the world?

Mr. BLANTON. No; but I do not want to build up so high—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Then we have no dispute, because these ships when constructed will make the British Empire and this great American Republic natural friends. It will perpetuate that friendship by going out on the seas of the world as equals, neither seeking to dominate or control the other. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. The question I was trying to ask is this: Why can not we now propose this disarmament instead of waiting until we have built up a Navy superior to all the world? Would it not come in better grace for us to propose it now to the nations of the world instead of waiting until the building of a superior Navy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is not any question but what the present Chief Executive will make the proposal in

due time. There has been authority on the statute books of the United States for four years to call a conference of that kind, and it has not been called. But the new administration has been in power only since the 4th of March and has met with many difficult and dangerous situations, many of them possibly not known fully to the Congress. But I know, and the gentleman from Texas knows, I think, that the President of the United States is in hearty accord with the doctrine of reduction of armament. But when that reduction comes it must not be upon a basis that will make our naval strength inferior to that of any other nation in the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 1 hour and 25 minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not want the Members who are serving in this House for the first time to be misled into the belief that they are accomplishing such reductions in appropriations in this bill that they can feel that they have complied with all their pledges of economy, because this feeling would not be justified. The fact is I can never agree with my friends on the other side of the House in their method of stating appropriations.

I was very much interested in the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] inquired so particularly about deficits, because since he last served in this House we have adopted a new method of appropriating money to run the departments of the Government. Up until two years ago the Congress appropriated directly the money necessary to run the departments of the Government, and by merely glancing at the statement of appropriations it was possible for any Member of the House to tell how much the Government was costing the people. But now that is impossible. For instance, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] tells the committee correctly that in the regular supply bill for this fiscal year—I mean the current year ending June 30—there was an appropriation of \$433,000,000, and a deficiency appropriation, in addition, of \$53,000,000, making a total of \$486,000,000. But I think what gentlemen on this side of the House wanted to know was the total amount we were paying on account of the Navy this year. And the fact is that in the closing days of the last Congress we put through a deficiency bill. I think that very few Members on the floor of the House ever appreciated exactly what we were doing, because unless one had the time to study it they could never comprehend it. In that deficiency bill we made an appropriation of all the unexpended balances of the annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1919-20. The unexpended balances for those years would have been covered into the Treasury on July 1. They amounted to \$114,000,000. By this deficiency bill we made that \$114,000,000 available for the expenditures of the Navy Department, in the first paragraph.

In the second paragraph we did a more remarkable thing. In the Navy Department they have what they call a general account of supplies and advances, and the total appropriation for all bureaus are pooled and credited to this account, and out of this account they then pay for all of the materials and supplies purchased by the department. Then if Construction and Repair wants \$50,000,000 worth of material they will buy it from Supplies and Accounts, and they charge that bureau then with \$50,000,000. As a result of the demobilization following the war the department found itself with \$300,000,000 worth of stores, and so in this deficiency bill you simply provided, though many of you may not have known it, that a new account should be established in the Navy Department, that should be known as the Navy supply account, and that it should be equal in amount to the value of all stores on March 31, 1921. So that by a bookkeeping transaction they wrote off that \$300,000,000 and placed it in a separate account in the Navy Department, and they provided that hereafter the Bureau of Construction and Repair, or the Engineers, when wanting to purchase material, could go over here and purchase this material at a price to be fixed at the market value for this month, instead of the amount the Navy actually paid for it last year or the year previous.

Now, you and I know that materials are 25 to 33½ per cent off, and instead of having \$300,000,000 worth of materials they are going to deduct 25 to 33½ per cent from the amount paid for this material. And hereafter when the Bureau of Engineering or the Bureau of Construction and Repair goes to buy material, it is going to buy more material by at least 25 per cent than it could have bought if you had not passed this deficiency bill. And therefore when you appropriate for any given bureau in this bill \$100,000,000, it is really equal to an appropriation of \$125,000,000 if you had not passed that legislation in the deficiency appropriation bill.

Do you see what it means? They say it is a bookkeeping account, but if you will reduce the price of what I have to buy

by 33½ per cent, my dollar will go 33½ per cent further than it would have before you reduced the price of my material, and I will not need so much money to satisfy my needs. That legislation enabling a bureau to purchase materials at prices quoted to-day instead of what they cost amounts to an increase in appropriation.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. What, then, is the total appropriation in this bill according to your estimate?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am sorry to say to my friend that there is no man on earth who can tell, for the reason I have set forth.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Approximately?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will tell you why. If you take those appropriations and add them, it would mean that during the current year we had made available for naval expenditures \$940,000,000. But I know that all of that material is not going to be used by July 1. Most of it will be used during the next year. Therefore it really increases the amount of the appropriation that is carried in this bill. But how much it is impossible to tell; it will depend entirely upon when that material is purchased. Whenever it is used it means that for \$90,000,000 you can purchase more material, and it is equal to an appropriation to that extent, but when it will be used up nobody can tell, and therefore you can not state the figures.

Now let me tell you about the third paragraph.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The plan of reappraisal referred to, as I understand, met with the gentleman's entire approval as a member of the committee, and the gentleman believes, with everyone who has studied it, that it is an entirely practicable and proper thing to do.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Instead of agreeing to that, I made the statement at the time that there was no excuse on earth for the policy you were pursuing and stated that hereafter no one on earth could tell what the Government is costing. What the people of the country want to know to-day is what the military service of the country is costing, in order that they may intelligently discuss it. How can they know it?

Now, in another paragraph of the same deficiency bill we read—

That the storage account is hereby increased out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated so as to equal the value of the stock on hand in clothing and stores account on March 31, 1921, as shown by the records of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

The best information I can get on that point is that it is equal to \$40,000,000, but covered up, never accounted for in any statement of appropriations in this House. It says an amount—

equal to the value of the amount of clothing on hand is appropriated out of the Treasury out of funds not otherwise appropriated.

It is an appropriation, yet it is so covered up that you can never tell it, and it amounts to \$40,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes. Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will consume 5 minutes more.

I am supporting this bill, and will vote for it for several reasons. In the first place, I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who has just completed his remarks, that until there is some disarmament this Nation can not disarm and must maintain its Navy as the first line of defense. I support it for the additional reason that when this bill was sent to the Senate in the last session of Congress it was increased by the Senate Naval Committee approximately by \$100,000,000. Therefore I am frank to say that as between this bill and a bill appropriating \$100,000,000 more there is no question but that in a case of that kind we are going to stand for a saving of \$100,000,000, even though some gentlemen in the House having responsibility do not lead us in doing that.

Mr. MONDELL. Just what does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Just what I said. The language was plain, I think.

Mr. MONDELL. Whom has the gentleman in mind who is not proposing to support this bill?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The time will come when that will be shown. I want to know if the gentleman from Wyoming is going to be there? I know that in the last session of Congress the gentleman failed me once, and ran me out on a limb and left me while I was trying to save \$2,500,000.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is complaining about something that he thought ought not to have been appropriated. I thought that ought to have been spent.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman at first thought it ought not to be spent. Then he left me and went "where the woodbine twineth," and two and one-half millions went with him.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman stands by, I will support him on this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman from Wyoming stands by us, the House will stand by us. My friend knows that we are appropriating for the current year, outside of these indirect appropriations, more than five and one-half billions, and the gentleman knows that 90 per cent of it has been spent for wars, past, present, and future. If that is spent for wars, past, present, and future it means an average tax of \$50 for every man, woman, and child in America in order to maintain war expenditures for the past and present.

My good friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] said in concluding his remarks that he favored disarmament. So does everybody. All sane men on earth favor disarmament. Yet no Government is now functioning to execute the will of the people. My friend said that for four years there has been statutory authority for the President of the United States to bring about disarmament, and that nothing has been done. I do not know where he has been, but all men know that during the last two years the President of the United States did more than call a conference; he urged the inclusion in the covenant of the League of Nations of the provision for disarmament.

The gentleman opposes the League of Nations. I am not opening up that discussion, but the gentleman knows that one thing that caused many men to look with favor upon the league was that it contained the only constructive plan for disarmament that had ever been proposed to the people. Now he contends that the present President of the United States will call a conference. I am not going to criticize the President. I know that when this bill was last considered the proposition was made to provide that these appropriations should not be available until a conference was called. I voted against it because I wanted to leave the President foot-loose to call a conference whenever he desired. But 60 days have passed, and although the President has been busy, no business has confronted him so important as to take steps to reduce the armaments of the world. [Applause.] The gentleman from Michigan says the President will call a conference. I hope so, but I hope when my good friend from Michigan makes the statement he will not be as badly disappointed as were the President's Secretary of State and Secretary of Commerce and the other leading Republicans of this country constituting the immortal 31, who said that by electing Mr. Harding we could better insure our entry into the League of Nations, with reservations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAPES). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 30 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the enormous increase in national expenditures and to present the reasons therefor. The one predominant reason, effective in the past as well as in the present, is the cost of war, of the results of war, and of the preparation for future wars. It will be instructive for us in this connection to make a review of budgets from the beginning.

The total expenses of the United States Government from its beginning, in 1789, until the 30th day of June, 1861, a period of 72 years, were \$1,970,000,000.

Then commenced the great Civil War. In the first three years of that struggle, from 1861 to 1864, expenditures surpassed the total for all the preceding 72 years and amounted to over \$2,000,000,000. If we add to that amount the expenses of the following year, 1865, they would reach the sum of \$3,396,000,000. In order to be entirely accurate it is necessary to disentangle from that total the civil expenses of those four years and incidentally to remark that in every period of war there is an inevitable tendency toward expansion and extravagance in civil expenditures as well. But when due allowance is made for all these so-called civil expenditures, the total cost of the Civil War was \$3,100,000,000 down to the 30th of June, 1865, and that did not include a very large sum due upon claims thereafter liquidated between 1865 and 1870. So that the cost of the Civil War alone makes this startling showing of expenses nearly twice as great as the governmental expenditures in the 72 years preceding that time.

The late war has its lessons that are equally striking. The final estimate has not yet been made up. We can not tell how



much is due to the direct and indirect costs of this conflict, but it is probable that the total cost will be quite as much as the total expenses of the Government in the 128 years preceding.

The total estimated cost of this Government down to 1917 was approximately \$33,000,000,000; or if we make a computation merely to the 30th of June, 1916, the total was \$31,880,905,000. When we take into account the expenses of the following years, including loans to the Allies, care of soldiers, vocational education, the expenses of maintaining the Shipping Board, deficits in railway operations, and interest on the public debt already paid, it is a safe estimate to say that the total amount will exceed the \$33,000,000,000 preceding 1917.

One of the most emphatic comparisons we can make is based upon the maximum month of expenditures—December, 1918, the month following the armistice. During this month there was expended, including \$389,000,000 advanced to the Allies, the sum of \$2,060,000,000. Let us note that in that one month there was expended more than the total cost of the Government in war and peace from 1789 to 1861; the average disbursements in a single day were greater than for the whole of the first 11 years of our existence as a nation; greater, also, than the total of any year down to 1856. That single month also was equal to the most expensive year down to 1917.

How insignificant in comparison seem to us the early expenditures of this Government. The appropriation bill first passed—September, 1789—contained 11 lines. After that there was a disposition to be more specific in expenditures, and a few years later we find in one of the appropriation statutes this language, which seems to us quite out of date:

Twelve hundred dollars for candles and firewood in the Treasury Department, not including the Treasurer's office.

Not until 1800 did the appropriation equal \$10,000,000, and not again after that until 1809.

In after years there was a gradual increase in per capita expenses and in the aggregate. These increases were principally due to conditions of peace or war. Our per capita expenses in 1850 were \$1.77; in 1860, \$2.01; in 1870, \$7.61; in 1880, \$5.28; in 1890, \$4.75; in 1900, \$6.39; in 1910, \$7.30; in 1919, \$144.77. If I had more time, I should be glad to dwell upon the two varieties of appropriations which may be roughly divided into the protective, including the Army, Navy, fortifications, and the management of the Department of Justice, and on the other side the developmental, which are devoted to education, to investigation, to preparation for the material and social future. Beginning about the year 1900 there was a great increase in appropriations for research and for social betterment. That was the time when subjects of general welfare and new theories in regard to the proper field of government began to hold sway.

But if we compare the appropriations in the early years of this century, increases were due far and away more to enlargement of the Navy and to increased cost of the Army than to anything for the upbuilding of the material and social welfare of this country.

It is surprising to note how masters of finance have failed to recognize the increase in expenses of the Government, which received a very considerable acceleration about the year 1830 and again about the year 1880, although the effect was not fully realized in this country until after 1890. M. Villèle, the French finance minister in 1822, brought in a budget carrying a billion francs, a little less than \$200,000,000 of our money, and remarked to his colleagues: "Salute these figures, gentlemen. You will never have opportunity to contemplate them again." But he lived until 1854 and saw more than 20 budgets larger than the one he had presented.

Our own Gen. Garfield, who was a master of the fiscal policies of this Government, made a speech in this House in January, 1872, in which he stated that the per capita expenses of the Government ought to decline, and that by 1876 the total appropriations should be diminished to \$230,000,000, of which \$95,000,000 would be for payment of interest on the public debt.

He also ventured the opinion that unless some very extravagant statute should be passed the expenses for pensions had reached their maximum, and that was when the amount was less than \$30,000,000 per year.

I am making these statements to show how futile it is to attempt any pruning without a radical change of the policies of our country in regard to war and peace. An estimate has been made that by a partial reorganization of the departments 20,000 employees can be discharged. What does that mean? A saving about equal to the cost of a single battleship. Large expenses will continue as an aftermath of war. In the year that ended June 30, 1920, appropriations aggregated nearly \$5,900,000,000, of which barely \$400,000,000 was for the civil expenses of the Government. Thus 93 per cent was associated with war and 7

per cent for peace. For the disabled and suffering who fought in the late great struggle provision ought to be made to the last scruple in the Treasury. [Applause.] We all agree to that.

There is pressing demand that we be liberal and progressive in civil expenses, in providing for good roads, for great public works, for the educational departments of this Government. Our Department of Agriculture is really a great university, and it has conferred untold benefits on the farmers of this country, and others as well, by its investigations. I have always been a lover of peace and am reluctant to vote for this bill, but, on the other hand, I can not see my way clear to vote against it. In our declaration of "America first" there stands in the very forefront our protection against all foes, foreign or domestic. We must appropriate for an adequate Navy and at least the nucleus of a strong Army. This is not the time for the pacifist that believes in independent action. This is a time when we are living in a troubled era, when war may break out in almost any portion of the world. The roots of hate and bitterness have run deep, and it is for us to be ready for any emergency which may come. But I do say this, Mr. Chairman, it is a time for international negotiation or conference, for the sake of stopping this mad competition for the construction of armaments. [Applause.]

What have been the principal causes of war? Rapacious ambition of dynasties, national pride or sordid selfishness, suspicion, and fear. Happily the first of these causes was wiped out when the last sovereign of the Hohenzollerns crossed from his country into Holland. Other dynasties have fallen, and we can not expect another war due to any such cause. But other reasons still remain.

But is there not a burning lesson from the suffering and destruction of the late war? Is there any country or any race under heaven that desires another conflict with the loss of life and the consequent waste and suffering extending into every class of society? Is not this the occasion for the President to call together the nations of the earth and say, "Come, let us reason together; let us do away with this absurdity and this waste." Common sense, that which gives wise and orderly direction to the action of so many persons, ought to bring this competition to a close. Every nation says it is acting in self-defense. The attitude of some might be caricatured by the hypocritical expression of Uriah Heep, who said, "We are very 'umble, sir; we are very 'umble, but we are afraid that other people who are not 'umble will get the start of us."

Our position for this movement is most advantageous. Let me call attention to the fact that our country is rich. Heaven knows that we have the resources and man power. If there is to be competition in navy building America need not be left in the rear. [Applause.] We have the resources to build the largest Navy in the world if we will. Yet I can not altogether agree with the idea that we should seek to surpass the navy of Great Britain, and I do not understand that this bill necessarily points to that. In the first place, there is an overwhelming improbability of any contest between the two great branches of a kindred race. In the next place—and I speak this with due regard for diplomatic expression—the United Kingdom has various hostages to fortune. Her greatest and richest Anglo-Saxon possession to the north of us in case of war could be overrun in a month. Still, further, England is dependent on us for supplies vital to her very life. So a contest is unthinkable between the two countries. From such an examination as I have given to the bill, it seems to me it is in the right direction. It is not on the most extravagant scale and there is no threat for any foreign nation in it. It is but a plan under which we can continue adequate preparedness and possess that strength which will enable us to deal advantageously with all other nations.

Our country is now respected in all the chancelleries of the world, and, in addition to that, there is a feeling, however it may be obscured and however much jealousy may tarnish it, that we have performed a wonderful service to the world in overthrowing despotism and in aiding weaker nations. Then, too, in the works of compassion and mercy, as by the Red Cross and public and private agencies, we have fed the starving and brought succor and healing to the sick; we have furnished shelter to the homeless, lifted up the heads of the broken-hearted and placed them on the road to hope and recovery. It is not merely our gold that we have poured forth without stint—it is the devotion of our men and women in the face of pestilence and death which gives a glory to the United States unsurpassed by our achievements on tented fields. Thus we are in a position which entitles us to confidence and to leadership. Let that leadership be for peace. Let us hope that on the ruins of a suffering and a chastened world new foundations of hope and faith may rise, dedicated to justice

and to order, to liberty, to lasting peace, and in that splendid movement which looks not merely to 1921, but to the ages, our country may proudly be in the lead. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, it was inspiring and comforting to hear the splendid address of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] who has just taken his seat. I am sure that we all appreciate and sympathize and agree with the inspiration and the noble words he expressed, that we should labor in the cause of peace and reach ultimately an agreement with reference to the reduction of armaments, in order that we might relieve the people from the burden of taxation. The bill now being considered is identical, without any change, with the bill as it passed the House in the last session of Congress, and failed of enactment in the Senate. On the 10th of February last I discussed at length and attempted to analyze and call attention to what I thought were some defects in the bill. It is not my purpose now to attempt to rehearse what I said at that time. The committee has seen fit to report the bill without any change or any modification.

I have a different purpose in coming at this time before the committee. I desire to call attention briefly to the condition of our Navy and what we have. Through the legislation that has passed in the years gone by, the provisions made for its enlargement and for its development, both in matériel and personnel, have given us the position that when the program is completed we will have, as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], in fighting value and in military ability and efficiency the equal of any navy in the world. I wish to see that Navy not scrapped, not forgotten, not neglected, but maintained as a capable and efficient Navy, so long as it is necessary that the United States should have and maintain a capable and efficient Navy. Whatever changes may be reached in the future, I do not want those changes to bring about inefficiency or incapability; whatever character of navy we may have, be it large or small, I want it capable and efficient.

I have some extracts here from the Washington Post which I desire to call to the attention of the committee. They refer to our Navy. The new Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Denby, took the oath of office on the 5th of March last. About the middle of March he made a trip of three weeks, or about that time, visiting the fleet in its practice in Guantanamo Bay. From the issue of the Washington Post of April 5 I read a portion of an editorial:

The record trip made by the destroyer, the U. S. S. *Pruitt*, in bringing Secretary Denby from Santo Domingo city to Washington, a distance of 1,600 miles, in 55 hours through heavy seas and without a stop of any kind is a crowning proof of the fine condition of the Navy. The Secretary's tour of inspection was short, but, as he himself testifies, instructive, and the message he addressed to the fleet and the marine stations shows that an excellent impression was left on his mind. "I found the Naval Establishment," he says, "generally in splendid shape. The men seem zealous and eager, the officers working hard for the good of the service."

That is the testimony of the present Secretary of the Navy, published in this newspaper 30 days after he took the oath of office, after having made a tour of inspection to look into the matter.

In the issue of the Washington Post of April 6 last there is an article written by Mr. George Rothwell Brown, and from it I quote:

The United States Navy must be ready for instant service. This has been announced by Secretary Denby as the policy of his administration. To-day there is no occasion to worry over the condition of the Navy. Its condition with respect both to personnel and material is, all conditions considered, satisfactory. The war and the post-war period that has been denominated as demoralization still leave our Navy in fighting trim.

This is the reassuring word which comes from the man who is the general manager of this great national corporation employing upward of 200,000 fine American men, most of them highly skilled and having an assessed value which the gentleman in charge would like to ascertain and may seek to obtain.

I quote from the same newspaper of yesterday another item:

Navy destroyer records went by the board when the U. S. S. *Pruitt*, bringing Edwin Denby, Secretary of the Navy, home, made the run from Santo Domingo City to Washington, a distance of 1,600 miles, in 55 hours without a stop of any kind.

This was only one of the many demonstrations of the Navy's fitness made for the Secretary during his three weeks' absence and which he said made him "a better sailor than I was before."

Also the following, from the issue of the Washington Post of April 23:

NORFOLK, VA., April 23.

When the battleship *Pennsylvania*, flagship of the Atlantic Fleet, displays "set sail for home" signals in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning, she will be followed out to sea by 50 fighting ships that have made probably the greatest record at target shooting with large and small guns in the history of the world.

When the fleet left American waters last January, a program calling for the most extensive maneuvers ever planned for an American fleet was in possession of Admiral Wilson on board the *Pennsylvania*. This

program has been carried out to the letter, and the marksmanship displayed by gunners on ships of this wonderful fleet probably will win for them official recognition from the Navy Department and from President Harding himself.

I have mentioned this in order that I might pay a just tribute of merit to these sailor men themselves—the splendid personnel, commissioned and enlisted, the men in the navy yards who do our repair work, the men who construct and build our ships—the entire Navy. I wish to pay to them a just recognition of their service, and the praise and commendation which they deserve. [Applause.]

Following that I wish to mention that the Washington Post can not be accused of a bias in favor of the former Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Daniels. In two weeks' time after he goes out of office the new Secretary goes into an investigation, and the newspaper which I have quoted, which has led the van in denouncing and ridiculing and slurring the former Secretary of the Navy, gives this proof that I have submitted to you, not biased, prejudiced proof in favor of the former Secretary but merely stating the facts that we have a wonderful Navy in personnel and matériel, in all circumstances and under all conditions. I thought it only right and proper that this meed of praise should be expressed before this House and the American people—this indorsement of the capable, efficient, worthy, meritorious, honorable service of Josephus Daniels, the former Secretary of the Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Does the paper say that this is because of Mr. Daniels, or in spite of him?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not say; but we all know that the man who was at the head and directed its development is entitled to the praise. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN].

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, the aspect of this bill which I wish to discuss is the one that provides for continuance of what is called the building program. I address myself to that because I believe it goes to the very crux of the gravest problem which the world confronts to-day—and that is the problem of how the world is to disarm. I am one of those who believe that disarmament is not a matter about which the world has any power of election. The question which the nations of the world must decide now is not whether they will maintain huge armaments or abolish them; it is whether they will disarm now while they have something left with which the world can reorganize and reconstruct its industrial life, or delay disarmament until the weapons of war are forced out of their hands by collapse of the whole industrial structure.

This, Mr. Chairman, may be considered the language of exaggeration. Let me begin by justifying it. Because I can not help feeling that the extent of the devastation caused by this war is but faintly appreciated in the countries which have not been its theater. There is a rather general idea that its ravages were confined to the fields on which its battles were fought, and to portions of certain towns that were destroyed, and to the seizure of certain property. A very eminent financier, at the head of what is probably the second largest industrial organization in the world, on his return from Europe a short while ago gave out an interview in which he said that practically all the damages wrought by the war were repaired because a majority of the fields which had been devastated in France were now being cultivated, and I think he said that 60 per cent of the buildings that had been destroyed were either rebuilt or in process of rebuilding. Well, nothing could reveal a narrower conception of what this war has done in the way of destruction than that remark. The war has been destroying not merely the things that were ruined by shot and shell in actual battle but things everywhere throughout the world; the things that you and I needed though we were more than 3,000 miles from its theater.

For I ask you just to conceive its operations. Every shell that was exploded cost in the neighborhood of \$1,200. Now, the capital which was expended in the making of that shell could not have been employed in the production of tables or chairs or clothes or food, and that withdrawal of capital from production by these necessities of war caused a scarcity of them, and that scarcity resulted in the high cost of living which afflicted every family in the world. If you want to form a vivid idea of how the ravages of war affected the people of this country, just look at your own salaries. I do not think that it is any exaggeration to say that the \$7,500 which a grateful and appreciative Government fixed in 1907 or 1908, I think, as a proper compensation for our services here are worth at this time more than \$3,000 by comparison with the standards of value



then prevailing, so each one of us here has been ravaged about \$4,500 a year. And that same scale of ravage applies everywhere—everywhere throughout the world. Now, it is true that for a while people did not seem to feel this spoliation very much. In the late war, as in all wars, the nations concerned in it seemed to have gone on a first-class spree. They found themselves living on their capital, and for a time all seemed to go "merry as a marriage bell." So long as any of that capital remained wages were increased somewhat in proportion to the increase in prices, and everybody thought the world was a happy place, where wages would continue to multiply so long as the cost of living continued to rise. But there came a time—that time is here, and here now—when the supply of capital approached exhaustion, and the exhaustion of capital manifests itself in unemployment; there is no longer the means of keeping human hands active in the field of industry. No longer able to obtain any raise of wages, the multitudes were without power to purchase commodities, and the owners of these commodities are driven to the alternative of selling them for what they can obtain, even at less than cost, in order to avoid a greater loss. But no one will continue to produce when he must sell at a loss. We see a very striking illustration of that condition in the case of Mr. Ford's enterprise. He sold automobiles during the war faster than he could produce them, notwithstanding an advance in prices, until the gradual exhaustion of capital produced unemployment, which narrowed the demand. In an attempt to stimulate the demand he reduced prices to the prewar level, even though he was compelled to sell his product at a loss. Now, Mr. Ford could afford to do that. But he occupied a very exceptional position. He had an industrial organization of enormous value. I have heard it stated by competent authority that the organization itself was worth \$35,000,000 or \$40,000,000.

Manifestly the disbandment of that organization would entail an enormous loss. He is rich enough to sell at a loss for a while. But nobody can sell at a loss very long. The ordinary manufacturer can not sell at a loss without going broke, and therefore if he can not find a profitable market for his wares he stops production. Then comes unemployment, then comes the dire spectacle I endeavored to describe here the other day of men and women in throngs, hopelessly, despairingly seeking a market for their labor and finding themselves every day unsuccessful in the search. I pointed out then that a slight derangement in the machinery of exchange—that is to say, a slight interruption in the exchange of commodities—produced panics at different intervals, each of which was followed by a period of depression lasting from four to six years. Here we have not a derangement of the machinery for exchange of commodities, but we have total destruction of commodities on a stupendous scale, and that destruction has been followed by failure to produce them. Three-fourths of the capital of the world is destroyed. Ten millions of men in the flower of their youth and of their productive capacity are killed; 10,000,000 more are rendered industrially ineffective by wounds and damages suffered in campaigns. If it took four to six years to recover from the depression caused by derangement of the machinery for exchange of commodities, how long must it take to recover from this wholesale destruction of commodities? The world shrinks, appalled, from contemplation of such a problem. But is there no way by which this terrible destruction can be repaired and the calamities it threatens arrested? There is just one way, and that is by disarmament. [Applause.] I think it is capable of demonstration that there is a waste going on throughout the world which if arrested would not merely restore the prosperity which we have lost, but which would raise conditions of human existence to a plane higher than ever yet achieved—higher than we are now able to conceive. Let me remind gentlemen that maintenance of armaments is almost equivalent to making war. I pointed out some 10 years ago in this city at a banquet following a meeting of the Society for the Encouragement of International Arbitration, when I endeavored to show that the explanation of a steadily increasing cost of living in the teeth of a continuous growth in the tide of production, which seemed a phenomenon to many, was entirely simple. It was due entirely to the erection of enormous military establishments by the great nations of the world. Gentlemen whose memory may go back for 25 years or a little further will recall the steady decline in prices and the steady rise in wages that followed our Civil War and the substitution of free labor for slave labor throughout the country which it affected.

Then capital was so abundant that all manner of enterprises, public and private, were prosecuted on every side. I remember in the early eighties the city of New York borrowed money at 2 per cent, and the lenders bid against each other until

they put the bonds to a premium. To-day the city of New York would have hard work borrowing at 6 per cent. Picture to yourselves what that means. It means that we could have built three subways for what one would cost to-day; it means that three structures like the Equitable Building could have been raised for what that one structure would cost to-day. And conceive how prosecution of such enterprises would stimulate the demand for labor and increase the rate of wages. To-day building is practically suspended. Diminished employment, restricted production, lower wages, harsher conditions of existence, are the price that huge military establishments cost. And that is the penalty. The person who toils and draws a salary or lives on a fixed income must pay for these crushing burdens that armaments impose on the world. I beg to remind you that it is perfectly simple to explain why the cost of living began to rise at the beginning of the last century and continued rising until this war broke out. Why? Because the cost of armament was constantly growing at a rate that far exceeded every increase in the volume of production. It was the phenomenon of that time that while production was growing more abundant, prices, instead of declining as they should have declined by reason of plenty, were constantly rising. The explanation was simple. There was no plenty. If I see a stream of water flowing into a vessel and the contents, instead of rising, diminish, there is but one explanation. There must be a leak producing a waste greater than the volume of supply. If the contents remain stationary, it means there must be a leak that balances the supply. If the contents rise, then I know the vessel is sound. During all those years, from the end of the last century down to the date of this war, armaments were increased continuously, until 5,000,000 men were kept idle in barracks and \$5,000,000,000 were expended in their support. Not one of them could provide his own subsistence, not one of them could furnish his own uniform or pay for his support. The support of those soldiers was drawn from the production of men who did work.

Every man, practically, that worked carried upon his shoulders the burden of an idle man, made idle by the military system that held him useless in barracks. Here was the waste which accounted for the rising cost of living in the teeth of increased production against which men and women were crying out everywhere before the war began. My friends, that system is going on now, and it is against it that I have risen here to address you and try to see if we can discover a way by which the world can escape from the disasters that persistence in militaristic enterprises and preparations threaten to bring upon the whole human family.

In those days armaments were defended on the ground that they made for peace; that without them the nations would all be fighting. I undertook to point out then that they were not making for peace at all, but that they were actually rendering war inevitable. Indeed, before the Great War began these nations maintaining great armaments were already at war, except that each one instead of destroying the property of another nation it was destroying the sustenance of its own people. Never had prosperity so smiled on the world as during that generation, and yet the reckless folly of men pushed away from women and children the cup of abundance which a bountiful Creator had offered to their lips. One lesson of the late conflict is that instead of ending war armaments make war. It is absolutely impossible in the light of recent experience for any nation to have armaments of great size and avoid war, for you will see readily that when all nations are arming the object for which each nation strives is to have the strongest armament.

There is only one use for armament and that is to strike an enemy. I have often been amused by the idea—though I acknowledge freely its altruism—of an ex-Secretary of State who went around negotiating treaties with every nation that would listen to him—and most of them did—by which they agreed that in case of differences between them they would not fight for a year after the *casus belli* arose. Let us examine the character of that arrangement. Let us assume that nation with a strong army is engaged in a dispute with a nation which has a weaker army. If the stronger nation strikes at once, it gets the benefit of its greater armament.

If it waits for a year, the other nation will have an opportunity to become equally strong. If the stronger nation strikes at once, when it is strongest, it can settle the result of the war in advance. It can determine the fact that the theater of the war will be the enemy country. And what nation would allow its own land to be devastated, the homes of its own people to be ruined and burned, when by striking first it could subject the enemy nation to those inevitable conditions of war? So, Mr. Chairman, I think treaties by which strong nations bind themselves not to strike the weaker nations with which they are in dispute until they can complete military preparation which

will make them equally strong may be discarded as long as human nature remains the same.

I believe everybody will agree that disarmament is highly desirable, even though some may not go so far as to agree with me in the conclusion that it is absolutely essential, not merely to restoration of prosperity but to the survival of human life. As I told you the other day, conditions of life in the cities have become such that if we must remain cursed with this burden the bread lines will be increased and the bread lines may not always be peaceful.

How is this disarmament to be effected? Various gentlemen throughout the world have proposed different methods by which disarmament can be accomplished. I think there is just one that can prove effective. It could never be possible before, but the providence of God has made it possible now. We can effect disarmament. [Applause.] We can force it on the world. And that without attempting the slightest interference with the independence of any other nation or offending against the proprieties or even the niceties of diplomatic intercourse. Until disarmament is accomplished throughout the whole world, this country must maintain the greatest military establishment on land and sea. I will give my reasons for that belief.

To begin with, we will all agree that no nation would incur the tremendous expense of maintaining a huge armament except in the hope of having the greatest one. No sensible nation would want the second biggest one. I do not know if I can appeal to the experiences of gentlemen here, but there is a game known among many Americans as poker, and I think it is considered among experts in that accomplishment a fundamental rule of poker that the worst hand is not the lowest, but the second best. Now, the second-best armament among nations is like the second-best hand at poker. [Applause and laughter.]

It serves no purpose except to get its holder into mischief and bring him to disaster if not ruin. [Laughter.]

Now it is conceded on all sides that we can establish the greatest armament if we desire to do so. Since we have absolute power to establish the greatest armament in the world by land and sea, no other nation can have any but the second largest armament if we elect to exercise our power. Gentlemen sometimes say, "We are in no possible danger of attack." I think we are by no means free from danger of assault. If ever there is another general war, it will be like all other general wars, a union of nations to overthrow one grows so powerful that others fear its domination. And if there should be such a union in the future, it would be a union against us. I say that not because I suspect any particular statesmen or any particular country of unusual hostility against this country. I base it upon the unbroken lessons of all history. There has never yet been what is called a general war unless it was a combination of nations against one that had become dominant, or appeared likely to become dominant, as, for example, the war against Spain in the time of Philip II and the war against Louis XIV, which was a combination of all the nations of Europe to prevent the domination which was threatened when he conquered Holland. The combination of all the nations of Europe against Napoleon is a familiar story to everyone.

Now, we are to-day preeminently the strongest Nation in the world. The only object for which another World War will be waged is to limit and overthrow that dominant nation. If there be any excuse at all for armaments, we, who have the greatest position to maintain the most extensive possessions and territory to defend, are driven of necessity to establish the greatest armaments by land and sea.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I believe, and other gentlemen have suggested agreements among the nations to reduce armaments. These I believe would be as useless as Mr. Bryan's series of treaties, by which nations agree not to fight for a year, and thus the stronger are expected to surrender their predominance and then fight afterwards. I think the suggested agreements between nations to limit armaments are equally absurd. If you are going to fight a man, just think of agreeing with him how hard each of you would strike the other. [Laughter.] That is practically what these agreements would seek to effect. The mere statement of it, I think, shows its absurdity.

Yet a pathway to disarmament is open to us and to the world—a pathway straight and sure—if this country will lead the way. My suggestion—and I think it is the only one that will absolutely result in certain disarmament—is for this Congress to equip the President with the greatest forces by land and sea, and then incorporate into the statute establishing these military forces a provision to the effect that we will disarm just as rapidly as all other nations of the world will disarm;

that we welcome disarmament; that our most cherished object is disarmament; that the providence of God, for the first time in the history of the world, has so ordered events that the nation capable of establishing the greatest armaments does not want armaments, but abhors them, and stands ready and eager to use its power for the creation of the greatest armaments in the world to drive all armaments from the face of the earth. [Applause.]

We all realize that when it comes to actual treatment of this question the hands of the President must be left entirely free. But it is incumbent upon us, as well as our right, to establish our own domestic policy. It is a purely domestic question what military forces we establish, and we have the right here to organize our military strength so that the President will be in a position to say to all the nations of the earth, "We seek no domination; we only seek equality, but it must be an equality of disarmament. Put away your armament and we will gladly accompany you in that act of renunciation. If you do not disarm, if you persist in maintaining armaments, the experience of the world shows that while any nation retains armaments, no other great nation can disarm, and therefore we will outarm any or all of you." I have no doubt that disarmament can be secured by adopting this plan of creating the strongest forces in the world and authorizing the President to reduce it as other nations reduce their military establishments, empowering him to do effectively that which he has already declared his intention to do, giving him the means by which he can say to these nations in a voice which will resound through the world as though inspired by heaven itself, "We will be first in armament if you make us; we will be first in disarmament if you let us." [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, that might very well complete what I have to say if it were not for one other suggestion, which I think should be placed before you. We are not here of necessity reduced entirely to the sole task of facing and overcoming a peril that threatens to be fatal and irremediable.

I believe that the world is at a parting of the ways. I believe that every difficulty which rises before a man is an opportunity by which, if he be strong enough, he can rise to higher conceptions and nobler enterprises than he had ever before undertaken. So every difficulty that arises in the pathway of humanity is an opportunity. In a degenerate age it may be an obstacle arresting all progress, but in a great, glorious, progressive age like this it can be converted into a stepping-stone by which men may reach a height of achievement that is now undreamed of.

After every great war in the history of the world one of two conditions has ensued. Where it was a war waged to satisfy dynastic ambitions or religious prejudices or racial hate it was always followed by a long period of depression. The Thirty Years' War left a large part of Europe prostrate for two generations. The wars of the Spanish succession, which is another term for the wars against Louis XIV, left all Europe prostrate. France passed into that dreadful panic that followed the bursting of the South Sea bubble, the desperate speculation by which it was sought to revive in wild gambling the prosperity lost in war, and England itself passed into that period of prostration when Horace Walpole's corruption destroyed the fame of the Parliament and almost brought about its destruction. On the other hand, the wars of the French Revolution, which were the most destructive ever waged on this earth up to that time, were followed by the extraordinary progress which I endeavored to outline here the other day. Think of it! Conceive how the hands of men suddenly became reenergized when they were given access to the soil and allowed to cultivate it for their own profit, a right which had been denied them under the survivals of the old feudal system which the revolution swept away.

At once we had the invention of illuminating gas, that dispelled darkness and made every hour of the 24 available for labor. We had the application of steam to machinery, by which distance was annihilated. We had the invention of the telegraph, by which intelligence was exchanged between men so rapidly that their cooperation in production was wonderfully stimulated. And then we had these later inventions, which at the close of the last century and the beginning of this seem to have completely transformed the conditions of human society.

After our Civil War, although that was the most devastating conflict which the world had ever experienced up to that time, we all know the wonderful prosperity that bathed this land as the reward for the substitution of free labor for slave labor and the extension of justice throughout the whole country. Now, if the result of this terrible cataclysm should be the abolition of armaments, if all the energies of men should be turned



at once to the tasks of production, if the terrible exactions of government for the expenses of military establishments should cease, the conditions that would ensue are incapable of description, because we can not conceive them. Think of it! Three-fifths of our taxes would be remitted almost immediately. The numbers of men now under arms, either waging war or preparing for war, would be turned out to labor, and, as I endeavored to point out the other day, no human hands can produce anything by labor without creating occasions for the employment of others. In a world relieved from these crushing burdens of military enterprises or preparations for them, with all the energies of men devoted to production, six hours' labor would be enough to support any family in comfort and affluence. And the growth of intelligence which would come from the utilization of these wider periods of leisure must produce a race of which this great race that we know, of which we are members, the greatest that ever inhabited the world, would be but the promise of a still greater race whose virtues and qualities would diffuse throughout the whole universe blessings and benefits that are absolutely immeasurable.

So, my friends, I say the world stands now at the parting of the ways. It must either move upward through disarmament, democracy, and justice to a prosperity that will be immeasurable or it must sink down through militarism, through confusion and disaster to ruin that will be irretrievable. I do not doubt for a moment what the choice will be. This country, which seems to have been withheld from knowledge of the world while men were devoted to enterprises of plunder and destruction, while labor was held in contempt, and the spoils of military conquest considered the only wealth that a man could acquire with distinction and enjoy with credit among his people—this country, which was held in darkness while the world was engaged in ruthless schemes of conquest and of vengeance springing from religious hate or racial prejudice, until the veil concealing it was rent by the prow of Columbus's ship to where men had become improved to the point where they were capable of establishing on this soil, unstained by bloodshed, by bigot or tyrant, institutions of liberty, of justice, and of progress based upon the divine revelation that all men are equal in the sight of God and that equality is the essence of justice—this country is now leading the civilization of the world. [Applause.] I believe this country, so blessed and so distinguished by Almighty God, will lead the world now along the pathway of disarmament and justice to a high plane of civilization, where peace will be perpetual, because justice will be universal, and peace and justice together will be the fountain of prosperity measureless and unending, flowing over the whole earth, embracing and blessing all the children of men. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back whatever time I may have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back seven minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the House I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] for his most eloquent and in the main logical speech. The gentleman from New York uses the term "disarmament," meaning, as he himself states, a limitation of armaments. The gentleman does not exaggerate. The world must either agree to a limitation of armaments or go bankrupt. There must either be an understanding that the competitive programs of enlarging, extending, and multiplying the instruments and instrumentalities of destruction shall cease or the progress of civilization will not only be arrested but the far advances that we have made will be largely lost. In the early period of the development of the race wars, bloody and destructive as they were, were as but child's play compared with the frightful havoc and destruction possible through modern wars. Even the war the world has just passed through, frightful and destructive as it was, brings us but to the threshold of the possibilities of destruction that lay in the new and frightful inventions of offensive warfare.

The organization of capital in modern times, the extension and enlargement of the means of transportation, the possibilities of levying on all the world for the resources of war are such that it is very easy to imagine a condition of things under which the entire world might easily be brought to a condition even worse than that of Germany at the close of the Thirty Years' War.

I can not, however, entirely agree with the gentleman from New York relative to the means and methods for accomplishing a reduction of armaments. While treaties are unfortunately frequently scraps of paper in the hands of others than the late Emperor William, still treaties do remain the only means we have by which nations solemnly obligate themselves in mutual agreements. And in the main treaties are lived up to, thank God. It is only the exceptions, the awful exceptions that raise our doubts as to the efficiency and efficacy of an agreement through treaties. While I agree with the gentleman from New York that we must not unreasonably or improperly abate our preparations until there can be a general reduction of armaments, still the world needs no notice from us in increases of military establishments as to our ability to maintain great war establishments, greater if necessary than those of most of the nations of the world combined.

Our population, our resources, and our wealth are known to all the world, and I think it is hardly necessary for us to unreasonably extend or enlarge preparations to convince all the world that so far as we are concerned we could—with peril to ourselves and at great loss and burden to our people, it is true—still move on in the reasonable tenor of our way and maintain establishments overshadowing those of any combination of nations in the world. As the world knows this, it is not necessary for us to unduly swing the big stick. As nations know this, it is our duty at the proper time, in the proper posture of our foreign affairs, to invite the nations of the world to a meeting at which they shall discuss and agree to a limitation of armament. That is for the future, but not, I hope, the very distant future.

But to-day we have before us a very practical matter. We have reported a bill carrying nearly \$400,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy. It looks very large compared with appropriations of \$100,000,000 and \$125,000,000, and \$130,000,000 made along about 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914; but it is small compared with the enormous expenditures not only during the war but immediately following the war. In the fiscal year of 1920 our total appropriations and deficiencies for the Navy amounted to \$620,000,000. But that sum did not measure our naval expenditure by any means, for, in addition to those sums appropriated for that period, were vast sums of money, amounting probably to at least a billion dollars, appropriations made during the war and still available during that year and largely expended during that year; I do not feel qualified to make an accurate estimate of the expenditures, but they must have been much over a billion dollars. For the present fiscal year our expenditures will probably be a little less than half a billion dollars—\$487,000,000, with possibly some small deficiencies yet to come.

In the face of estimates of over \$600,000,000 the committee has brought in a bill \$8,000,000 less than \$400,000,000. It is an enormous sum of money, and yet it would do nothing more than carry on the program agreed on in 1916 and maintain in commission all of the real effective and essential fighting ships of the Navy. It is similar to the bill the last Congress passed in the closing days of its last session. At that time in another body it was increased about \$100,000,000. What its fate may be when it again reaches the Senate I do not know, but it is touching the possibility of the increase of the bill elsewhere that I want to appeal to you. We believe that this bill is sufficient, in fact quite liberal. The \$90,000,000 for construction is perhaps not too much, but it ought to be enough with somewhat reduced costs for the carrying on of the 1916 building program which under the present conditions we are not justified in curtailing.

The balance of the appropriation will maintain us 100,000 strong—men sufficient in the opinion of those best versed in the House on the subject to keep every essential ship manned and ready for action.

The increases in another body related to many items where in our opinion increases are not needed. To a considerable extent they related to new construction, the addition of airplane carriers to our building program. There was new construction for naval stations and bases on the Pacific coast. The House takes the position as regards these new stations and this new construction that it is not a matter that we should be called upon to determine or provide for in this bill. The Naval Affairs Committee, presided over by the able and genial gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], and having a personnel on both sides of the House of men well acquainted with the needs of the Navy, is prepared to consider any suggestions the Navy Department may care to make relative to new construction and to the establishment of new naval stations.

The committee reporting this bill has no authority in that behalf. Furthermore, the bill was first reported in the last Congress, less than two months ago, and at this time we know of no urgent reason demanding immediate settlement of those questions and immediate provision of appropriations for them. They can be considered by a committee having full knowledge and jurisdiction, and then if two months or three months from now or at any period prior to our regular appropriations of the winter there seems to be a need and a demand and a necessity for an appropriation for some of these new things, the Congress can provide for them. But we should not be called upon to pass upon those questions now. That would eliminate from consideration by the committee of conference of at least half or approximately half of the hundred million dollars added to the bill elsewhere in the last Congress. Of course, the House conferees will meet the conferees of the Senate on all questions freely and fairly, but, with the exception of perhaps an additional appropriation of \$8,000,000 or a little over—I think \$8,000,000 was the amount the committee of the House agreed upon—for airplanes, it is the opinion of most of the Members of the House that this bill makes ample provision for the Navy to maintain it in its present strength, though necessitating certain economies, which can be brought about without reducing the effective fighting strength of the establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen reporting this bill are very familiar with the needs of the Navy. The members of the legislative committees of the House having charge of naval matters are familiar with the needs of the Navy, and that committee is in general accord with the view of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill. I trust there will be no weakening in our position relative to the bill. Having made proper, substantial, generous provision for the Navy, with the exception of the one item to which I have referred, and which we expect to provide for, the House will, I hope, stand in the main by the bill as it is now presented. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, it has been extremely difficult for me to follow the brilliant address of our eloquent Member of Congress from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. Of course, it is always a pleasure to hear him. When you hear him you see a flower garden, you visualize beautiful things. I have been trying to find out his process of reasoning. The substance of his address seems to have been that war is horrible, that the keeping up of armaments gives notice to the world that we intend to carry on war and that we are preparing for war, and that, therefore, we should have as much armament as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble with the United States until recently, so far as our foreign relations are concerned, has been that we have had no definite foreign policy. This is as true of the Democrats as of the Republicans. We all know that we entered the war after a campaign in which the principal slogan was "He kept us out of war." When the Republican candidate for President in that memorable campaign, now the distinguished Secretary of State, one of the most brilliant men in the public life of the United States, was asked what he would do, he said that he would keep all of the German ships then in American waters until the end of the European war. That is as far as he would go. He never dared mention war, never dared talk about war. We had no definite policy; we had no definite program.

I entirely disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] that the United States is seriously menaced by anybody or that the United States is in a position to dominate the world. It is entirely untrue. We are not in a position to dominate the world, and the world does not fear domination by the United States. It is true that the United States is invulnerable, unassailable; that the United States is invincible for purposes of defense, but that is an entirely different proposition. That does not mean that we threaten anybody else. With all of its overwhelming power the British fleet and the allied fleet could not take possession of a single German port, and with all its preponderance over the Russian fleet the German fleet could not take possession of a single city on the Baltic coast. The United States need fear no other nation or people, nor can any European people seriously fear the United States.

I have not the time to develop the subject, but what were the causes of wars in the past? We had dynastic wars. They are out of consideration now. We had religious wars, wars between

various sects. They are eliminated now. Then we have had wars for the consolidation of nations. The Germans who fought as a unit in the last war had been divided prior to 1871. The Saxon fought the Bavarian and the Bavarian and the Saxon fought the Prussian with the same bitterness with which they fought the allies in this war. It was a war for national consolidation. The Civil War in the United States was of the same character. What was the cause of the recent wars? They were almost all of them economic wars, wars for cash, every nation considering itself an economic unit and fighting every other economic unit for commercial advantage.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman does not mean to say that war on our part was conducted for dollars.

Mr. LONDON. I want to say that the late war, so far as the European nations were concerned, was primarily due to an economic conflict. The former President of the United States said in one of his speeches, when he came back the second time from Europe, that every child knew that the origin of the war was economic. And do not forget, please, that for several years he kept on telling us that we had nothing to do with the causes which brought about the conflict in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman yield me a few minutes more?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LONDON. When you speak of having the largest and best Navy, so far as the United States is concerned, it can logically mean only one thing, and that is a Navy suitable to carry out the program of the United States.

It is the only standard by which we can consider it. We are not to judge the fleet by the number of ships as compared with the ships of other nations; not by the personnel as compared with the personnel of other nations. The only question should be: Is the Navy suitable to carry out the program, the policy, of the people of the United States. That is the question, and that is the only test, the only standard by which you can measure the adequacy or inadequacy of the Navy. What we need is the adoption and proclamation of a policy. Do we intend to fight for markets abroad? Do we intend to fight with England or France or Italy or with Germany for the possession of Albania, for the possession of colonies in Africa? If we do, then we will have to have a Navy big enough to sink the rest of the navies of the world, but if our policy is to lead by example, to help develop strong men and women in the United States, to help perpetuate ideals of liberty, we need no big navies. All we need is to live up to the high ideals which have given birth to America, and America will be an irresistible force for good and for all time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has the right to revise and I object to the extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in serious disagreement with the general statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that this bill is quite sufficient, in fact, quite liberal; but this statement should be qualified to the extent of saying that the amounts carried in the bill are not wisely allocated. I do not think that the House will vote for any appreciable increase in the appropriation now carried for the Navy, but we must reserve the right, and I hope an opportunity will be given for the House to exercise such right, to provide additional funds for one arm of the service, which is now so essential to an efficient Navy.

It would be a serious mistake if this House let itself believe and led the people to believe that by expending \$395,000,000 carried in the bill in the way the bill directs, this would give us during the coming year, or on the completion of the 1916 building program, a strong and efficient Navy. All naval experts—and note, I except none—are now agreed that you must provide aero-carrying ships in order to provide a well-balanced and efficient Navy. Let me remind you that this House, since the armistice was signed, has authorized no new building program of any kind, notwithstanding the fact that the lessons of



the Great War show conclusively that ships authorized in 1916 will be wholly ineffective, unless you make adequate provision for naval aviation, including aero-carrying ships.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. But the \$90,000,000 carried in this bill, with proper authorization, can be wisely expended, so as to begin the construction of the additional craft needed, without increasing, for the next year, the amount now carried in the bill.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. The gentleman stated that we would not have an efficient Navy with the expenditure of the amount of money proposed, but will the gentleman kindly state how our Navy will compare with the other navies in the world when the naval program of the United States is completed?

Mr. OLIVER. I will answer by quoting naval experts, who recently appeared before the House Naval Affairs Committee, and who state that even if the 1916 building program was now completed and we should to-morrow be at war with two certain nations our large ships could not with safety be sent to sea. Why? Simply because, as they pointed out, we now have no modern aero-carrying ships to give protection to the fleet. Other navies are provided with this type of ship. The committee's action is not unwise in seeking to slow up the completion of some of the dreadnaughts provided for in the 1916 program. The reduction of the amount carried for new construction will have the effect of slowing up the completion of some of these ships. Originally it was intended to complete the entire building program of 1916 by 1923, but the Committee on Appropriations now feel that naval experts will wisely employ the funds provided by this bill in hastening the work on our battle cruisers and on such of the battleships as are now nearing completion, expending only a very limited amount on those battleships the construction of which has not greatly advanced. Two good reasons suggest this course. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] has eloquently spoken of one of the reasons, and I am sure there is not a man in Congress who does not now entertain substantial hope that in the near future the President will call a conference of the nations—certainly a conference of our recent allies—and that some agreement which our people can place reliance in will be reached looking to a reduction and limitation of armaments. The House Naval Affairs Committee during the early part of this year had extended hearings by leading naval and Army officers on this subject, many of whom served overseas during the war, and all were in accord that if the President should now call a conference of the nations, especially of France, Great Britain, Japan, Italy, and the United States, that an agreement would be speedily reached looking to an immediate reduction and limitation of armaments. A distinguished citizen of Great Britain also voiced this same belief. So if this hope, which we all entertain, has any real foundation, we may be losing nothing, but may be large gainers by slowing up the completion of our dreadnaughts. Then, again, you will recall that in the bill of 1916, providing for this large construction program, we appropriated \$200,000 to be expended by the President in defraying the expenses of a conference of the nations of the world, called to consider the reduction and limitation of armaments, and that in that same bill the President was given authority to discontinue the construction of any ships which he considered inconsistent with any agreement made looking to a limitation of armaments by the nations engaged in the conference.

A second reason suggests that the genius of America has not yet discovered the last word in battleship construction. While we are now building the most powerful battleships and battle cruisers that the world has ever seen, yet we hear rumors from a very reliable source that other nations may soon lay down ships of this same character that will be so far superior in speed and gun power as to place in the discard the great ships authorized in the bill of 1916, and for which this bill now carries a large continuing appropriation for construction. If it should develop during the next fiscal year that naval experts have designed ships far more destructive and powerful than those we are now building, who will contend that it would not be wise to discontinue the construction of some of these ships not far advanced, even though it result in the loss of seven or eight million on each ship? If we continue to build we must be sure when we spend our money that we are building the very best and most powerful ships afloat.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I have listened to the gentleman with a great deal of interest, but this thought comes to me: Why it was and what was the advantage of going into a building program of such dimensions in 1916, which now the gentleman says may be absolutely useless in a few years?

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman quotes me too strongly. I did not intend to convey the idea that they will be useless, but that there is a possibility, after the lapse of four years and with lessons learned from the Great War, that naval experts may find it necessary, as they have often done in the past, to radically change the plans, which it was thought in 1916 would give us the best and most efficient battleships and battle cruisers afloat.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I would like to know what the reason was for the program.

Mr. OLIVER. To those who served in the House in 1916 the reason for the program was obvious. The sentiment of the country strongly demanded that the American Navy be strengthened along the lines of the 1916 program. The country very promptly gave approval to the action of Congress, and there were but few, if any, dissenting votes to the passage of the bill. We very properly said in that bill to the nations of the world, "We are not anxious to complete this large program, and we are even providing in the bill that authorizes it an appropriation of \$200,000 to pay the expenses of representatives of other nations to be called together by the President at the end of the war to consider the reduction and limitation of armaments," and the President was authorized by that bill to discontinue the building of ships inconsistent with the spirit of any agreement that might be made looking to a limitation of armaments.

I feel that the House is not interested in a comparison between the amounts carried in this and some previous bill, and reference to such a comparison might be construed as a political suggestion. So far as I know, neither the Appropriations Committee nor the House Committee on Naval Affairs has suffered politics to enter into the framing of its naval policies or naval bills. Of course, there have been large reductions, and they were very proper reductions. Why? First, because you were rapidly decreasing the personnel of the Navy. We had at one time 500,000 men in the Navy, and even last year we appropriated for an average of 120,000 men, and now you appropriate for only 100,000 men, making a difference in this one item alone of more than \$15,000,000. Then, again, in the last bill, to which reference was made, you provided \$104,000,000 for the building program, but this amount has now been cut to \$90,000,000, making a difference of \$14,000,000 in this one item. Then, again, the other bill, to which reference was made, carried large appropriations for new construction work at our navy yards, yet this bill carries only an appropriation for upkeep and maintenance. These and other items to which I could refer account in a thoroughly proper way for the difference between the amounts carried in the present and former bills.

No one is more interested in economy than the present chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs—a gentleman for whom I entertain the highest respect and regard—and no one will ever expect him to bring in a bill from his legislative committee for additional ships for the Navy not absolutely needed, as disclosed by advice and opinions from the best naval authorities. Before you can wisely allocate the funds carried in this bill it will be necessary to secure from the legislative committee of the House authority to appropriate for the new craft to which I have heretofore referred. I trust that any bill reported by the legislative committee will be given a preferred status, and can be immediately considered, so that necessary appropriations can be then made to provide for any authorizations that the House may approve.

It may be strongly insisted in another legislative branch of the Government that the personnel of the Navy should be increased for the next fiscal year to 120,000 men. This will enable the Navy to keep in commission a larger number of ships, but many of these they propose to keep in commission have little, if any, military value, and I am of the opinion that a hundred thousand enlisted men, well trained, will keep in full commission sufficient ships and will enable the Bureau of Operations to keep in reserve, in such condition that they can be quickly placed in active commission, all of our other ships that have military value.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Gladly.

Mr. LAYTON. Can the gentleman tell the House, if he has the information, how the appropriation for the United States Navy for the ensuing year compares with the appropriations made by such nations as England and Japan?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not sure that I can give the gentleman the exact figures, but I think allusion was made to that in the report, if not in the speech, of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. BUTLER. It is less than England and more than Japan.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. In case the President should call this convention, and they should agree upon disarmament, would the President still have the power to stop this expenditure of \$90,000,000?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the 1916 bill gives him this authority. If not, this House will certainly carry out any recommendation that he might make.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Was the question whether or not the President could discontinue the building of these ships?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; if an agreement looking to disarmament was reached, would the President be authorized to discontinue incompleting ships?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My recollection is that he could stop the building of any ship uncontracted for. I have the act here, if the gentleman will permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman from Michigan may be correct, and if I am wrong I will be glad to have him correct me.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The act says that—

If at any time before the construction authorized by the act shall have been contracted for, there shall have been established with the cooperation of the United States of America an international tribunal or tribunals competent to secure peaceful determination of all international disputes, and which will render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armament, then in that case, such naval expenditures as may be inconsistent with the engagements made in the establishment of such tribunal or tribunals may be suspended, when so ordered by the President of the United States.

Mr. OLIVER. I may add in that connection that four or five of the large ships building are being constructed in our navy yards, and not under any contract whatever.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. How many ships have been contracted for?

Mr. OLIVER. All but 12 destroyers, 9 submarines, and 1 transport. This bill carries a provision that no part of the appropriation can be used for the building of ships on which construction work has not already begun.

The House may be interested to know that the Navy Department estimates that the battle cruisers and battleships now building will cost approximately \$38,000,000 each. This is the information supplied me over the phone a few minutes ago by Admiral Taylor, of the Bureau of Construction, and the estimate is intended to cover ammunition and everything else necessary to fit out the ship for service.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman must have misunderstood him.

Mr. OLIVER. No; this is the information which he gave me over the telephone only a few minutes ago, and, of course, he was but approximating in round numbers the cost when he stated \$38,000,000 each. I am quoting Admiral Taylor.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So am I. I talked with him day before yesterday, and he told me that \$34,000,000 would be an average estimate.

Mr. OLIVER. Now, there is another matter that may be of interest to the House, and one which the Committee on Appropriations has no power to correct, but I am glad the chairman of the legislative Committee on Naval Affairs is present, so that he may take such action as he deems advisable with reference to the matter. Doubtless the Secretary of the Navy himself may correct it without legislation. It was developed before the naval subcommittee that yielding to the insistence of naval officers the 1922 class at Annapolis has been ordered graduated in December, 1921, and there is a rumor afloat that the 1923 class may be graduated in June, 1922. Every member of the subcommittee on appropriations, and I think members of the House legislative committee, are of the opinion that this course is unwise. The authorities at Annapolis—the high naval officers there—have disapproved it and feel that it will be hurtful to the service and harmful to the young naval officers.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman understand the reason for it?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason doubtless is the fear on the part of some officers, now holding high temporary commission, that they may not be able to maintain that rank after December next, unless there is an inflow from the bottom. Is that the gentleman's belief as to the reason?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I promised all of the time.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry, since the matter last referred to should be brought out clearly.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. To revise his remarks, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama, under the rules, has the right to revise his remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I enjoyed very much the remarks of the eloquent gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], who pictured the joys of peace and voiced the desire of all the nations of the earth for peace. I hated to see him mar that picture that he had drawn by advocating a policy which I think would frustrate the attainment of his desire. I believe in international disarmament, but I do not believe that to undertake to become the first nation of the world in the great race for armament is calculated to reach the desired end. The poker story was very interesting, but not at all applicable. From what I am told about poker, it is a game in which you are trying to get what the other fellow has. I do not believe that we arm as a game, but simply for national protection. We are not trying to get what the other man has, but we simply want to have our own rights protected and the right to deal with other nations in a commercial way.

On the other hand, I agree with most of what the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said, but the trouble with his side of the House on the question of disarmament is that they have turned down the only organization having for its purpose securing of disarmament and have offered nothing in its place. They talked about what they were going to do toward disarmament, but they have not done anything, and mere talk will not get you anywhere.

However, I did not get up here to talk about disarmament, but to say something with reference to the theories of taxation advanced the other day by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], to which I listened with much interest, because he has given the subject a good deal of study.

If I understood his theory, it was that we should refund the Great War debt and spread it over a great period of years, and that we could, by virtue of the saving we would have in that way, be able to repeal the excess-profits tax and do away with the surtaxes, and then, as a third thing that he advocated, a sales tax for one year to pay off the floating debt of some \$3,000,000,000.

I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Ohio in regard to the refunding of the Great War debt. I believe such action would give commerce and business in this country a chance that would be beneficial to everyone. I believe it would be of great benefit if the people generally were relieved of a part of their taxes. But when it comes to applying the saving I disagree with him and part company with him. He would take off the excess-profits tax and the surtaxes and would levy the present taxes on the average man. I wonder if he has gone out throughout the country and talked to the average farmer, to the average stockman, the average salaried man, to ascertain whether or not he needs his taxes relieved. I would commence at the other end of the line, with the saving of expenditures in the way of paying out the principal and a part of the interest. I would increase the exemption of the single man from \$1,000 to \$2,000; the married man from \$2,000 to \$4,000. I would retain the present graded system of taxation and reduce it proportionately, so that all would secure the benefit of it.

But the curious part about the speech of the gentleman from Ohio was that, after arguing that business would be relieved by refunding the Great War debt and not paying it off because of the necessity of liquid assets in the business world, he turned around and advocated the levying of a \$3,000,000,000 sales tax, which is in direct contradiction and in open conflict with his theory as to the extended payment of the other debt.

Now, how he expects to get anywhere in the way of relieving suffering in this country by leaving the present average man's taxes what they are and then putting on his back an additional sales tax I do not understand. And, as a matter of fact, while the man who has a big tax to pay is the man who howls the most, as a rule, he will always be able to get by somehow. You are not relieving business conditions in the American Government by relieving the man of means and at the same time



leaving all of the present taxes on the average man and putting an additional tax on his back in the form of a sales tax. I do not believe that would be a good policy, and as a matter of fact it contradicts the other position that he takes.

Now, listen. I do not see how he is going to get any more liquid assets in this country by levying a sales tax. He seems to think that by taking some money from all of the people of the United States in the form of a sales tax and giving it to a few individuals in the form of relieving them of surtaxes he will create more liquid capital in America. Of course, you can not increase your money by taking it out of one pocket and putting it into another pocket, and it seems to me his statement and position are absurd for that reason. As a matter of fact, I will tell you what I think is the reason for all this propaganda about the repeal of the surtaxes and the excess-profits taxes. It has gone all over the country. It is that the man with a great deal of money objects to the surtax because you take it away from him after he has got it in his pocket and he has no chance to pass it on to the other man. If you put it in the form of a sales tax, he can collect it from every individual man just as he comes along, and he can pass it on to the consumer without any trouble.

But what makes it hard for the man of immense wealth, for the man of great resources, is to let him conduct his business, make his big profits, and then make him pay the money to the Government after that, at a time when he can not pass it on to the shoulders of the average man and the average consumer in this country.

I sympathize with the desire to reduce taxes, and by extending the war debt they can be relieved all along the line, but the whole people should receive the benefits of the reduction.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. It also has another effect, that it legalizes his desire to avoid his just part of the burdens of government. It legalizes the shifting that he now attempts to do covertly, and makes it legal and moral, does it not?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; and it not only does that but he will make a profit on every turnover tax that is levied. When we levied a tax of three-tenths of a cent on 10-cent cigars, their price immediately went up to two for a quarter. We levied a tax of three-tenths of a cent. In other words, they made a profit of more than 2 cents apiece on the tax; and when a sales tax is levied every time a thing is sold, and some articles are sold eight or ten times before they reach the ultimate consumer, there will be the tax each time and there will also be a profit on that tax, but you will not have any surtaxes or any way of leveling the differences in the fortunes of men.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. LAYTON. In other words, I understand the gentleman's position to be that he would not object, and I do not think a great majority of the people of the country would object to the sales tax, provided it did not double and treble and quadruple and quintuple, and every other kind of "tuple," by the time it reached the consumer.

Mr. JONES of Texas. At least that is one of the principal objections to it.

Mr. LAYTON. That is the principal objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is one of the principal objections to it. I think there are other objections to substituting it for some of the present taxes, because it will lay an additional burden on the average man who needs to be released and relieved more than the other man. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 14 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, in 14 minutes I can not hope to say what I desire to say in connection with the subject which has been under discussion this afternoon.

When this bill was up during the last Congress I made a few remarks with reference to the subject of disarmament and the subject of the gradual and constant increase in the appropriations for the Army and Navy during the past decade. We talk considerably here on the floor about disarmament, and yet we always vote with a good deal of alacrity for every increase that is proposed in the Army or Navy. If I recall correctly, when I became a Member of the House, eight years ago—I have not looked into the figures, to be exact—I think the appropriation bill for the Navy in 1913 was about \$130,000,000 and the appropriation for the Army was about \$97,000,000, making a total appropriation for the Army and Navy less than eight years ago about \$227,000,000.

After the Spanish-American War we boasted that we had become a world power. We had not merely become one, we simply realized that we were one. Prior to the Spanish-American War our standing Army was 25,000 men. The next reorganization bill that we passed after the Spanish-American War provided for an Army of 100,000 men, and the reorganization bill which passed the House after this war out of which we have just come provided for an Army of 280,000 men. So that the Spanish-American War increased the size of our standing Army 400 per cent. The Great War that we call the World War resulted in an increase of our standing Army to the permanent basis of 280 per cent. Now, if this arithmetical progression keeps up after every war that the United States has gone into, then if we shall have two or three more wars I am wondering what will be the size of the standing Army necessary to maintain the peace and dignity of the United States and keep us out of war. Eight years ago the appropriations for the Navy were \$130,000,000 or \$135,000,000. I think the actual amount expended during the fiscal year ended June 30 last was something like \$550,000,000. This bill provides for \$897,000,000, with the possibility of a deficiency bill that may be brought in later. The figures that are continuously given out to the people by those who are supposed to be in a position to know claim that the cost of the World War to the nations that were engaged in it was more than \$300,000,000,000. Now, it is almost impossible for the human mind to conceive how much money that is.

But if the statisticians are correct in estimating the total wealth of the United States, I feel justified in saying that if an earthquake should come to-night and swallow the United States of America there would not be any more wealth destroyed than was destroyed by the great World War out of which we have just come. It is also stated that the number of men, women, and children who lost their lives by reason of the World War amounted to more than 30,000,000 human souls, including those who were killed on the field of battle, those who died by injury, and those who died by starvation and disease and other causes. There are now in the world 1,800,000,000 people, 500,000,000 of whom belong to the Caucasian race. There are 54,000,000 square miles of territory, 48,000,000 of which are dominated by the Caucasian race. So we have a minority population of the world consisting of 500,000,000, which controls the rest of the population, and we have a minority of territory on which this race dwells which dominates all of the rest of the earth's surface.

Now, I do not intend to engage in the discussion of a question of race domination from a world standpoint, but it is a fact I think worthy of consideration that of the millions of people destroyed in the recent war practically all were members of that race which rules the world and has developed its greatest civilization. Is it not worthy of consideration among that race to see that some means is established by which this destruction may be lessened and, if possible, discontinued, in view of the constant irritation, in view of the constant restlessness of the so-called inferior races of the earth, which some day may undertake to throw off the so-called Caucasian civilization of which we are in the habit of boasting? Shall we continue to destroy ourselves while inferior races multiply by inconceivable numbers?

It is estimated that last year we spent in the United States a little over \$6,000,000,000 in carrying on the expenses of our Government. That is an enormous sum, but, my friends, eight years ago—which is as far back as I can remember, congressionally speaking—the total cost of the Government was less than \$1,000,000,000, and that included the Post Office Department, which is self-sustaining. Take out the Post Office Department, which pays its way, practically, and I think you will find that eight years ago, or even five years ago, the total expenses of the United States Government for all purposes were about \$687,000,000. That is nearly \$200,000,000 less than the cost of the Army and Navy alone will be this year. Therefore, from the standpoint of money, from the standpoint of taxation, from the standpoint of the burden that now rests on the nations of the earth that dominate forty-nine fiftieths of the earth's surface, there must be brought about some way by which expenditures may be lessened. All the nations of the earth are overburdened with debt. Not only that, but all the men, women, and children of the earth are overburdened with debt.

Every year we go more deeply into debt. Secretary Houston announced in his report last December that the World War cost the United States up to that time \$24,000,000,000. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], in his very eloquent and very patriotic speech—and I am glad to note that the time has come in this House when a man can be considered

a patriot without speaking for war and voting for unlimited taxes—the gentleman from Ohio said that the Civil War cost more than the total expenses of the Government in the 72 years of its previous history, which statement is true, and that the cost of the World War was more than the combined expenses of the United States Government from its foundation in 1789 until the 6th day of April, 1917. That is also correct.

Already many European nations have been compelled to consider the question whether they would repudiate their public obligations. If one great war, involving the entire surface of the earth, directly or indirectly involving the death of 30,000,000 human souls, involving the expenditure of \$300,000,000,000 in wealth, involving untold misery and suffering, is not sufficient to compel the leading nations to join together in some organization that will prevent war in the future and prevent the mad race for excellence of armament, I ask, in the name of patriotism and Christianity, what will it take to arouse the world to the need of such an organization for such an understanding as that?

On the day the armistice was signed the inventive genius of the world was keyed up to a higher pitch than it has ever been before in all the annals of time. More things had been invented to destroy life. On the 11th of November, 1918, inventive genius had reached a higher point than ever before. But we need not delude ourselves with the thought that this inventive genius ceased to operate on the 11th of November, 1918. It has continued to progress, and there have been inventions since the armistice by Germany, France, England, and by the United States methods of destruction of human life that will appall the world if war ever calls them into activity.

We read with great indignation about the poisoning of wells in Belgium and France by the Germans and about the chopping down of orchards by the retreating vandals. We read with great indignation and horror about all of the methods employed by the Germans to destroy the civilian population in the over-ridden territories of Belgium and France, but do you know that since the armistice was signed there has been invented a contrivance of some kind, a practice or a substance—I do not know what it is called—by which vast armies and areas of civil population may be destroyed not only from the air but through the use of electrical power without the infliction of a wound by a sword or a machine gun? If these things are to be continued by the nations that won the war, if they are to be perpetuated by the genius of those friendly nations that were allied together for peace and civilization during the great World War, what will be the result in the next war which is to come inevitably if these nations continue this mad race? My distinguished friend from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] says that we ought not now to undertake the question of disarmament; that we ought to wait until we have the largest armament in the world. When will that be? We say that we are continuing to arm because other nations are continuing to arm, and those other nations reply that they can not disarm as long as the United States, the strongest in man power, the strongest in wealth, the strongest in inventive genius, refuses to disarm; so that every time one side builds a battleship the other builds two, and when that one builds two the other side builds four. Consequently, there will never be a time, according to that philosophy, when the nations can get together and disarm, for if we have the right to say that we will not cooperate in this program of disarmament until we have the largest Navy then England has the same right and Japan has the same right, and if Germany should ever be rehabilitated and get along where she has a navy she will have the same international right to say that she will not disarm and go into any conference of disarmament until she has the largest navy in the world. That time will never come, and as a result of that philosophy the world will go on in this mad race, and instead of having \$396,000,000 to pay out for a navy and \$400,000,000 for an army on the part of this great peace-loving industrial Nation we will have all of those nations paying out billions upon billions of dollars every year in order that they may outstrip their neighbors or their imaginary rivals. If that process shall continue, where will the people be? Already they are growing restless over the fact that Congress is not reducing taxes. Every mail brings to us complaints of business men, farmers, laboring men, demanding that we shall not only shift the burdens of taxation but that we shall lift them. We can not lift the burdens, we can not even shift them, until we shift some of it by an international agreement among all of the nations of the world to pursue the paths of peace and bring about at least some form of international agreement and cooperation by which these enormous expenses shall be reduced and the people rescued from an intolerable slavery of fear and of debt. Upon our Nation rests the moral obligation to be the leader in such a movement. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in this bill, as in the last bill which failed of passage, there is contained a provision appropriating \$90,000,000 for the new building program. The distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. KELLEY of Michigan] says that before it is proper for our Government to propose disarmament we must so build up our Navy and make it so strong that under the percentage of reduction to be agreed upon we will still have the strongest Navy in the world. The representatives of every other nation, if they do not sit in the gallery and listen to him, to-morrow morning will know what he has said in the House to-day, and they will report to their Governments that the distinguished gentleman in charge of the Navy program of this Government believes that to be the case, and they will recommend to their respective Governments that before they can consider the question of disarmament they too shall so build up that when the percentage of reduction is proposed they will still be in a position to protect themselves with an adequate Navy. And there will be no disarmament. And so it goes, and so there is no reduction, and so the old Members and the new Members are still called on to vote \$90,000,000 for new construction.

The distinguished late lamented ex-Speaker of this House, Mr. Clark of Missouri, whose absence is deplored by every Member, was considered a statesman, and a great statesman. His judgment was considered good on almost every question. He was considered one of the best historians in the House. He knew politics nationally and internationally as few men will ever know it. We followed him on one side, and even on both sides frequently, on great questions. When this \$90,000,000 new construction program came up in the last Congress I offered a motion to recommit to cut out of it \$83,000,000, and only a mere handful of men voted for that motion, but in that handful the distinguished ex-Speaker cast the last record vote that he ever cast in this House—a vote for disarmament, a vote to reduce the expenses in building battleships, which in 10 years' time will be obsolete and absolutely useless. It is admitted by every man that any country in the world whom we might fear may attack us is now prostrate financially. Where is the country that we fear now? Where is the country that could prepare for war any more quickly than we could prepare for it? In the last conflict, if there was one thing which we demonstrated to our own satisfaction, as well as to the satisfaction of the whole world, it was the fact that we can build ships as fast as any nation on earth, and the fact that we could raise a trained army and get them on the battle front as quickly as any nation on earth. Yet we are told that because we might fear some power, for whom we should not have any fear at all, we must vote for this appropriation. I am not going to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not care to use that minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the naval service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.*

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I had not intended to speak on this bill at this time or about the question of disarmament, but I have been very much interested in some of the remarks which have been made on that subject to-day, particularly those of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. The gentleman from Ohio gave us a very graphic picture of the tremendous cost of war, both in lives and property. The gentleman from New York likewise gave us a very graphic description of the economic loss of war, due to the dislocation of productive activities.

I do not disagree in the least with these gentlemen in their statements that civilization itself will be threatened unless some way is found to stop the mad race for armaments among the nations of the world and prevent future wars. What is the way?

The gentleman from Ohio advocated that in order to bring about disarmament that the President of the United States shall call a conference and agree upon progressive disarma-



ment. I do not oppose such a conference and would not venture to oppose one if that is all that can be done, but these gentlemen must remember that when the nations engaged in the great World War met at Versailles and wrote the treaty of peace they provided an organization capable of bringing about disarmament. It furnished a definite plan and an organization with which to make the plan effective. Now, these gentlemen who have spoken so graphically of the horrors and the great losses of war spoke of the very conditions that were so keenly in the minds of the men who wrote the treaty of Versailles. The war, it is true, was over, but the world was in a more disturbed condition of mind than ever before. Empires had fallen and thrones had been overturned and were but as the dust of the desert, and it seemed as if the elemental forces had been suddenly unloosed and were about to overrun the world, and that unless some power greater than the forces of anarchy and destruction was found to combat it that all of Europe and all the world would be shaken to the very foundation of its civilization. That was the condition that confronted Lloyd-George, Premier Clemenceau, Premier Orlando, and President Wilson, and the other members of the peace conference. Now, the supreme question before them was: What could be done to prevent it? What power could be brought into play which would hold back the advancing tide of racial hate and sectional animosity?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLACK. These statesmen agreed upon the covenant of the League of Nations as the organization pointing the best way. Oh, I know gentlemen of Republican persuasion have criticized it very severely, and much of their criticism has been of such a petty nature that I am reminded of a speech of a lawyer in a justice court in a case for killing a cow in which he said, "Your Honor, if the train had been running as she should have ran; if the bell had been rung as she should have been rang; if the whistle had been blown as she should have been blew, both of which they did neither, the cow would not have been injured when she was killed." [Laughter.] Now, these critics of the League of Nations have not come forward with a better plan. They are quite content in standing off to one side and in assailing what was done and in saying, "If the peace conference had have been run as it should have been ran, everything would have been better if it had not been worse." Such an attitude for the great Republic of the United States to assume in so critical an hour is humiliating, indeed. When our forefathers were fired with the purpose to hand down the blessings of liberty to their children and their children's children, they organized to do it. They formed the thirteen struggling Colonies into the Republic of the United States of America and built that organization around our Federal Constitution. They had the vision to see that real liberty could only be preserved by preserving the authority of law and the energy of Government. That liberty without the protection of law is a possession of no value, and that under such conditions a man might walk the streets to-day unmolested and unharmed and be on his way to the guillotine to-morrow.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLACK. In just a moment and then I will yield. There were men of that day and time who were so shortsighted as to say that the Constitution of the United States would not be an instrument for the protection of liberty but would be used as the engine for its destruction. Just as some of the critics of the League of Nations have said it would not be an instrument of peace but an engine of war. And yet for more than 100 years this Constitution, which was condemned out of the mouths of these critics, has protected us against the despotism of the autocrat as well as the tyranny of the mob. Gentlemen, if we ever achieve peace and cooperation and security and get disarmament among the nations of the world, we will get it by some organization among the nations built around a definite, written agreement. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is somewhat past the point to which I desired to direct the question, but if I understood what the gentleman was trying to get at, he wanted to disarm. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell the committee why it was that when the covenant of the League was about to be written or about completed and that if we were to disarm as a result of that, it was necessary for the President of the United States, through his Secretary of War, to ask that the Congress give him an Army of 576,000 men at a cost of \$1,500,000,000 a year, and the greatest Navy in the world?

Mr. BLACK. Oh, well, the gentleman knows that Mr. Daniels stated before the Committee on Naval Affairs that if the United States went into the League of Nations, and it was adopted, then his recommendation did not stand. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, at the close of the Great War the United States stood as the towering figure of the time. Not as a conqueror with bloody, dripping sword, not as a tyrant swinging the weight of his clanking chains at a hopeless bewildered people, but as a strong, powerful friend seeking to assuage the wrecks of foreign Governments, and now we have the spectacle of the great free Nation of the world repudiating the solemn agreement which was entered upon by its accredited representative. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I had not intended to address the committee on this subject, but the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] makes me feel that I ought to do so. The gentleman says it is proposed by the President to call a conference and to endeavor to reach an agreement by which the peace of the world can be preserved. The gentleman then lauded the statesmanship of Orlando, Clemenceau, Mr. Lloyd-George, and former President Wilson because they conceived the idea of the covenant of the league as an instrumentality through which the peace of the world might be maintained, and then he leaves the impression that if the covenant of the league were adopted as a part of the policy of the United States we would to-day be in the position of disarming; but the gentleman forgets that when the League of Nations covenant was reported by Mr. Wilson as an accomplished fact, so far as he was able to accomplish that fact, that the first thing he did through his Secretary of War was to ask the Congress to give him an Army of 576,000 men at an annual cost of \$1,500,000,000. And the very next thing he asked was that the Congress give him a Navy greater than any other navy in the world, at a cost of a billion dollars per annum. We have not adopted the covenant of the league. Thank God for that! [Applause on the Republican side.] But we have reduced the cost of maintaining an army and a navy. The naval bill before us is reduced to \$396,000,000. The Navy Department, under the command of Mr. Wilson, asked for about \$896,000,000. So we have reduced this close to half a billion. Under the management of Mr. Baker, the Secretary of War, they asked for an Army of 576,000 men. We have reduced that to 158,000, and from the proposed cost per annum of \$1,500,000,000 to approximately \$328,000,000. So we seem to be making some sort of progress toward economy if not toward peace. We have prevented these great world statesmen from tying America to an obligation that would bind her to send her boys in uniform to fight the battles of the world by order of a council assembled in some foreign nation.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Is it not true also that the league did not provide an effective way of disarmament? And, specifically, did not England serve notice that she would not reduce her navy?

Mr. MADDEN. England wanted to be exempt from the 14 points. She asked that she be continued in the control of the seas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. And the United States to-day, as the result of the foresight and patriotism of American statesmen who were not concerned in making up this wonderful combination of peace and war, is not tied to the apron strings of the covenant of the league, but is left with her sovereignty free. We are not bound to fight the battles of Europe or to enter into entangling alliances or to engage in all the thousand-year-old quarrels between the peoples of Europe. We are not bound to send American boys in uniform to spill their blood at the dictum of European statesmen in wars in which we are not interested. We are a part of the world, it is true, and we shall take our place among the nations of the world and perform our duty as a great nation. America stands with her hands aloft beaconing the world onward. Under the matchless leadership of President Harding America will become the beacon light to lead the way and will not evade her responsibility. But in assuming it she will surrender no part of her sovereignty. Her policy will be an American not a European policy. It will be a policy approved by our own people and executed by our

own Government. It will be under our own Constitution. America under President Harding will continue to be master of her own destiny.

And we propose in the bill that is pending here to complete the Navy program entered upon in 1916, and when that is complete we will have a Navy as effective as any nation in the world. We do not want to control the seas at the expense of any other nation. We are not a warlike people. We believe in peace. But we believe the way to get peace is to be prepared to negotiate, and we believe that the way to be prepared to negotiate on equal terms is to spend the money necessary to complete the ships that are now on the ways. And when we can show, not on paper but on the seas, that we have equal power with any other nation in the world to protect our interests and defend our rights we will have no trouble in negotiating terms of peace.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it should develop by the time these ships that are now provided for are completed that they will be practically useless on account of the invention of some other modern device or construction, what surety would there be in the ability of the United States to negotiate a treaty?

Mr. MADDEN. If our ships are obsolete because of new inventions, all other ships of all other nations will also be obsolete. So we will be in as good a position as they are. In the meantime wisdom would seem to dictate the completion of the building program. With this accomplished we will be prepared to negotiate on equal terms. [Applause on the Republican side.] When we do that we need have no fear of not getting our proper place in the councils of the nations of the world.

Mr. BARKLEY. If all the nations are going to negotiate upon terms of practical naval inefficiency, what is the use in spending billions and billions of dollars in order to attain a result that will end up after all in all the other navies being practically useless because some one navy is useful?

Mr. MADDEN. I would rather take the word of some one who understands what scientific efficiency in the Navy really is than a statement like that of the gentleman from Kentucky, who knows no more about it than I do. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not claim to know as much about that as the gentleman from Illinois, because on that subject, as on all others, he claims to know more than anybody else in the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I make no claim to superior knowledge, but great wisdom is not necessary to see the folly of America entering upon negotiations for disarmament with her Navy scrapped in advance.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when the naval appropriation bill was before the House last session some of us on this side and a few on that side undertook to secure the adoption of an amendment to the bill providing for the calling by the President of the United States of a conference of nations on the subject of disarmament. We were not successful in that effort, but I am glad to know that the President has avowed his willingness and his desire to create or have a part in creating some kind of an international arrangement looking to the preservation of peace.

I have listened this afternoon with a great deal of interest and attention to this discussion about disarmament, but the trouble with our discussions about disarmament is that in the main they are simply discussions and never get anywhere. I dare say that later on, when we reach that portion of the bill where such an amendment would be germane, gentlemen on the Republican side of the House who declaim so eloquently in behalf of disarmament will, on the question of an amendment providing for the calling of such a conference by the President of the United States, vote against it. My own views are that while I believe that we ought to disarm in some concerted manner, for one, I am not in favor of ceasing the naval building program of 1916 as long as the other great nations of the world continue to build their great naval establishments.

It has been said that England will never war on us. Yet, notwithstanding the fact that our Navy is the only one that approaches hers in importance, she continues to pour into her naval program a large part of the revenues of the United Kingdom. I, for one, would not favor, of course, going out on the seas and hunting war with Great Britain; but we in building a Navy are no more challenging her supremacy on the seas than she is challenging our supremacy in the continuation of her naval program. [Applause.]

I do not believe in the realization of these dreams that the solution of the question lies alone in our own disarming; or that if we profess to the world that our intentions are entirely

honorable and peaceable, that we abhor war, that we entertain no ambition to occupy a place in the sun, all the other nations will follow in the procession and imitate our example. China is a striking illustration of such a situation. With 50,000,000 potential soldiers within her boundaries, she is to-day the plaything of Japan, whose population is only a fraction of her own. Rich in agriculture and in other resources that might make for a great and powerful nation, China still remains a drone so far as influence over the affairs of the world are concerned. I am in favor of saying to the rest of the world, "If you are willing to disarm, the United States will join you in that program, but so long as you continue to spend your energies and your resources in building machines of destruction with which to oppose any nation that crosses your pathway, we shall continue to build a Navy that your's can not rival."

But let me suggest to gentlemen who are dreaming of disarmament that the cure of the desire to fight lies in the removal of questions about which men fight. As long as nations are composed of human beings and as long as human beings entertain within their breasts the sentiment of envy, the sentiment of covetousness, the sentiment of ambition, the sentiments against which the commandments declaim when they say, "Do not covet thy neighbor's ass," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness"—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. As long as individuals entertain sentiments of that kind the world will witness disputes and arguments and differences between Governments and nations, and the only method of preventing nations from fighting in order to settle their disputes is to erect somewhere, somehow, an instrumentality for deciding those disputes and registering somewhere the enlightened judgment of a tribunal which will adjudicate the questions at issue, and behind which will rest the opinion of mankind. Why, it is not necessary to have a great navy or a great army with which to fight. The press dispatches of a few weeks ago brought the startling information that Costa Rica and Panama were engaged in hostile military operations. Has either of them an army? None to speak of. Panama has a fleet of little sailboats and a few skiffs and canoes. She has an army that consists of her police force, and although they are not armed, though they have not a military establishment, yet the citizens of Panama marched out to the Costa Rican border armed with sticks and clubs and cane knives to fight, to settle a quarrel with her neighbor over a little strip of territory that is worth merely a bagatelle, measured in the interests that great nations consider.

So, gentlemen of the House, we will never solve this question of fighting between nations until we set up somewhere an agency for deciding the questions that bring about war and for deciding the questions that bring about the disputes between nations that prompt them to arm. And I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that if he wants to solve these questions, if he wants to limit armament, he will do well to persuade that portion of our citizenship with which he is influential, to persuade the great party in whose councils he sits and which is now in power in both branches of Congress and the Presidency, that the course for America to pursue, a course that shall bring her unfading glory, is to lead the world to the establishment of an international tribunal.

Who cares if the President of the United States prefers to call it an "association" of nations, if it but contain the substance. We can best command the respect and the admiration of mankind by setting up an international tribunal or agency before whose bar we are not too proud to take our place and of whose decision we are not afraid. We may say to the rest of the world that the United States covets no other nation's territory; we are not pursuing the call of ambition; we do not desire that which belongs to another. Then, in our own consciousness of rectitude, in our own satisfaction that we have squared our conduct with righteousness, let them know that we fear to appear before no tribunal where justice and equity and the enlightened conscience of the world may sit in judgment; that we shall never have a quarrel, however just, that we shall fear to submit to such a tribunal. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question before he sits down?



Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman spoke of the difference between Panama and Costa Rica.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Am I right in my recollection that the Chief Justice of the United States settled that boundary; that there was a dispute between the two Governments as to where the line was, but that it was turned over to the Chief Justice of the United States to settle it?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Did he not settle it?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. And yet these fellows will not stand by it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I shall answer the gentleman. Chief Justice White did decide that controversy, and because Chief Justice White decided it, your and my Secretary of State sent unmistakable messages to both Costa Rica and Panama that since it had been settled in a tribunal of the kind I have described the United States would not permit them to fight over that question.

Mr. BLACK. And they quit fighting.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And they quit fighting, too. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GENERAL EXPENSES.

The Secretary of the Navy shall send to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session a complete schedule or list showing the amount of money of all pay and for all allowances for each grade of officers in the Navy, including retired officers, and for all officers included in this act and for all enlisted men so included.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and myself agree very thoroughly on one proposition. That is that as soon as possible we ought to reduce armaments, both military and naval. The difficulty with the gentleman is that he considers that they have reduced much more, in so far as the Army is concerned, than they did reduce. In other words, so far as the party in control are concerned, that matter is entirely at sea. Let us see what they have done. He said they had reduced the Army from 400,000 to 175,000 men. Now, that is not according to the record. Less than 12 months ago they passed a bill by the majority in this House fixing the membership of enlisted men of the Army at 280,000 men. In about two weeks thereafter they made an appropriation for an Army of 175,000 enlisted men. And, forsooth, because the War Department went ahead according to law and enlisted up to 238,000 men, they were charged with having defied the law and the powers that be by enlisting more than 175,000 men. Then they went to work and introduced and passed a resolution saying that they must not enlist any more men until it was down to 175,000 men. That went through, the President vetoed it, and we passed it over his veto. It came back and became a law, and within 30 days after that they passed an appropriation bill fixing the number at 150,000 men.

Now you have a statute for 280,000 enlisted men, you have an appropriation for one year at 175,000 men, you have a resolution fixing that as a maximum, and then you have an appropriation bill fixing it at 150,000 men. Now, who in the name of common sense can tell what the Republican Party means to have for an Army of enlisted men in this country? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Secretary of War has recommended an increase to 180,000 men.

Mr. STEVENSON. A bill has been introduced to make an appropriation for 166,000 men, in the Sixty-seventh Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. All these deficiencies are handled by deficiency bills which our friend from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] brings in here.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am not talking about deficiencies, I am talking about the state of uncertainty, the unstable equilibrium of the minds of the majority in this House as to how many men shall constitute the Army of the United States. That is the situation, and gentlemen talk about reducing the Army from 500,000 to 175,000 men when they passed a law making it 280,000. Those things do not work well together.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that the bill of which the gentleman speaks provided for an Army of enlisted personnel not to exceed 280,000 men?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Was it not optional with the War Department to enlist any number under 280,000 men?

Mr. STEVENSON. To be sure; but in the name of common sense when you fix the maximum has not the Secretary of War a right to go on under it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not true that Congress holds the purse strings and has the power to regulate in peace time the size of the enlisted personnel of the Army, and did we not do that when we provided for an Army of 175,000 men?

Mr. STEVENSON. That is true and always true; but the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that the Army had been reduced to a certain figure is a statement entirely at sea, because you do not keep the same figures two times within 30 days.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the previous Secretary of War proceeded to enlist up to the full authorized strength of 280,000, and that we now find ourselves with that load on our hands, that that is the difficulty we are up against and that we are trying to get rid of?

Mr. STEVENSON. That is not the fact. The previous Secretary of War enlisted men up to 238,000.

Now, with the present Secretary of War I have had this experience within the last 20 days. I asked him to discharge a boy who was put in before he was 18 years old, and, forsooth, because his parents waited nine months before applying they say that they have waived the right and will not let him out, although he is still under 18 years. I asked what they meant by wanting to reduce the number of 175,000, and they say that has nothing to do with it, and they will not turn the boy out.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I was somewhat amused at the gentleman chiding this side of the House because of the present military situation as to the size of the Army. The last year under President Taft the appropriation for the Army was \$94,266,000. This year the estimates came in from a Democratic administration for \$699,000,000. Now, does the gentleman think that when the last administration attempted to increase the Military Establishment over 700 per cent that it is fair within 30 days after a change in the administration to ask us to go back to the Taft administration?

Mr. STEVENSON. If the gentleman wants to turn the clock back to the Taft administration, which was not approved by a very large majority of this country—only the States of Vermont and Utah—

Mr. GOOD. It was approved by a larger number than was the Wilson administration.

Mr. STEVENSON. If he wants to turn back to that time, all right, I do not. I was not talking about extravagance. I was talking about the reduction of the Army, that when the Republicans were in control it has changed its mind three times in eight months about the size of the Army and passed three separate inconsistent resolutions or bills, none of which could be carried out.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I can not yield any further. I am in favor of maintaining the present program of construction of the Navy, just as reported by the committee. I am glad to see that they are carrying out the program of 1916, because that was a wise program, laid down by a Democratic administration, now being carried out by a Republican administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4803, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KRAUS was granted permission to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of H. R. 2800, Sixty-sixth Congress, and H. R. 5969, Sixty-fifth Congress, no adverse reports having been made thereon.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with a bill which I introduced to-day upon the decline of gold production in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall have to object.

## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that I made on Friday that permission be given to the Committee on Naval Affairs to sit during the sessions of the House—not every session, but there are important matters of business over there that need attention and I think this permission should be granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to make this statement, and I think it ought to go into the RECORD, so that gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber may understand the situation and the reasons which I think are good why this permission should not be granted generally and to apply to the sessions of this Congress. Already permission has been granted to sit during the sessions of the House to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on Ways and Means. Of course, that must be done, and it always is done. Permission was granted to the Committee on Agriculture and to the Committee on Immigration. I am sorry that permission was granted in view of the situation which I wish to present. There are certain other committees called the major committees of the House, so designated by caucus action here, and they will probably come in and ask consent gradually for the same permission as time goes by. If the majority members of committees sit during the sessions of the House, the minority members will have to be present also. To grant permission to those major committees will take out of the House, if they all attend upon the sessions of the committees and perform their duties, 60 minority Members. There may be times when it is desirable and important that the minority Members be in the Chamber here during the sessions of the House. With 60 gone it would not leave enough to demand the yeas and nays. Special committees will be appointed which will ask this permission, and already one has been created with permission to sit during the sessions of the House. For these reasons I shall have to object. I shall not object to permission to sit on any particular day the gentleman may desire to sit, or if we can arrange some reasonable limitation of time within which they may have permission I shall not object, but I do not think gentlemen should ask permission for this entire Congress that these committees may sit during the sessions of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. I would much prefer to withdraw the request and say to the gentleman that if it becomes necessary we will ask for a rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

71. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting recommendation in connection with two items of the naval appropriation bill for 1922, of the elimination of one technical engineer and one draftsman; to the Committee on Appropriations.

72. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of La Grue River, Ark. (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

73. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Red Lake at or near Redby, Minn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

74. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Camden Harbor, Me.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

75. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$65,000, required by the Interior Department for salaries, General Land

Office, fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

76. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$57,820, required by the Department of State for salaries and expenses of passport bureaus during the fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 50); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

77. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations, in the sum of \$70,620, required by the Treasury Department for the office of the Comptroller of the Currency for the fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

78. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922 (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

79. A letter from the chairman of the board of trustees of the Near East Relief, transmitting report of that organization for the year ended December 31, 1920; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GOOD, from the Select Committee on the Budget, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 30) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 14), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) to authorize the sale of surplus foodstuffs by the Secretary of War, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 16), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 245) granting the consent of Congress to the Trumbull Steel Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 17), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2251) authorizing an appropriation for the World's Poultry Congress, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 18), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3428) granting a pension to George Byrne; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3893) granting an increase of pension to George R. Robinson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4778) granting a pension to Eddie C. Long; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4971) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Carbon Hill, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) providing for a site and public building for post-office and other Federal purposes at Fayette, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) providing for a site and public building for post-office and other Federal purposes at Russellville, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.



By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 4974) to amend section 439 of an act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation, approved February 28, 1920, by adding a new paragraph to section 20a to be known as paragraph (13); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 4975) to credit officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force with time served in the Naval Auxiliary Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4976) granting the consent of Congress to the Trumbull Steel Co. to build a dam across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 4977) to authorize the President to reappoint in the Navy former officers of the regular Navy who resigned subsequent to November 11, 1918; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAHN: A bill (H. R. 4978) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: A bill (H. R. 4979) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Princeton, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Welch, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4981) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 4982) to relieve housing conditions by the encouragement of investments in real estate mortgages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4983) to amend an act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) to provide that all meetings of the Federal Reserve Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission shall hereafter be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wymore, in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4986) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Seward, in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4987) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at David City, in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4988) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Geneva, in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 4989) amending an act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1917; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRINGEY: A bill (H. R. 4990) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, loyal Cherokee Shawnee, and loyal Absentee Shawnee, and Delaware Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4991) increasing the limit of cost for a post-office building at Shawnee, Pottawatomie County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) increasing the limit of cost for a post-office building at Chandler, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 4993) providing for cooperation between the United States and State Governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) to make April 13 of each and every year a public holiday in the District of Columbia, to be known as Jefferson Day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) for the erection of a public building at the city of Susanville, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) to establish, equip, and maintain an agricultural experiment station near the town of Dorris, Siskiyou County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) for the erection of a public building at the city of Yreka, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) for the erection of a public building in the city of Auburn, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) for the erection of a public building at the city of Placerville, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5000) for the erection of a public building at the city of Redding, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5001) for the erection of a public building at the city of Quincy, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) for the erection of a public building at the city of Alturas, State of California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) to provide for the consolidation of forest lands in the Plumas National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) to provide for the consolidation of forest lands in the Shasta National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5005) to provide for the erection of a public building at Newport, Cocke County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5006) authorizing increase for post-office building at Gilmer, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 5007) to provide for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Shreveport, La., and for alterations to the present building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 5008) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5009) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 5010) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5011) to provide emergency financial relief to the farmers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5012) to provide for the construction and improvement of waterways; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sanction the use of certain titles on tablets and other memorials; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5014) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5015) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) to prevent fraud respecting securities offered for sale within the District of Columbia, to provide a summary proceeding therefor, to register persons selling securities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) to make the necessary survey and to prepare a plan of a proposed parkway to connect the old Civil

War forts in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5018) to authorize the widening of First Street NE., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets NW., lying between Potomac Park and square No. 88, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) to provide for the sale by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of certain land in the District of Columbia acquired for a school site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) to authorize the opening of a minor street from Georgia Avenue to Ninth Street NW., through squares 2875 and 2877, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 5022) to create a cause of action for compensation in damages for injuries sustained and death resulting from injuries to any person through the wrongful act or omission by an agent, officer, or employee of the United States Government, and to provide procedure therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5023) directing the remission of customs duties on certain War Department property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5024) to regulate the marriage of persons in the military and naval forces of the United States in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 5025) to provide for the protection of the monetary gold reserve by the maintenance of the normal gold production of the United States, by imposing an excise for revenue and other purposes upon all gold used for other than monetary purposes, and by the payment of a premium to the producers of newly mined gold, and providing penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 5026) to provide for the erection of a public building in the borough of Tyrone, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5027) to amend an act approved February 28, 1899, entitled "An act relative to the payment of claims for material and labor furnished for District of Columbia buildings"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5028) making appropriation for the construction and completion of certain public works on the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 5029) to provide allowances for mothers with children under 16 dependent upon them for support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEE of New York: A bill (H. R. 5030) to amend the Penal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 5031) to provide for the erection of a public building at Everett, Bedford County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5032) to provide for the erection of a public building at Barnesboro, Cambria County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 5033) supplemental to the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5034) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOCHT (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 5035) to amend section 833a of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 5036) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Imperial County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 5037) authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish a system of mileage books to be issued at a reduced rate by all railroad companies carrying passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 5038) to make just compensation for land taken over under proclamation of the

President for the naval training station at Great Lakes, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) terminating the state of war between the Imperial German Government and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) terminating the state of war between the Imperial Austro-Hungarian Government and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from storm in the State of Arkansas and other States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) to repeal section 8 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WARD of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) authorizing the President to require the United States Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.) to take over and dispose of 13,902 tons of sugar imported from the Argentine Republic; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOULD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 81) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BUTLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) ratifying the reestablishment of the boundary lines between the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CODD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCKRAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) declaring the policy of the United States with respect to disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 13) to create a joint commission of agricultural inquiry which shall investigate conditions and suggest remedial legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING: Resolution (H. Res. 70) to investigate the administration of the Federal reserve act since its passage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 71) authorizing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to sit during sessions of the House and the recess of the Congress, to compel the attendance of witnesses, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths to witnesses; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, in connection with the development of a waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, in connection with world disarmament and withdrawal of our troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, requesting that the next battleship be designated *Wisconsin*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, in connection with passage of the French-Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, in connection with a national memorial archway; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: Memorial of the Legislature of West Virginia, in reference to pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of West Virginia, in connection with legislation in behalf of disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on Education.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 5039) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cornell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) granting a pension to Thomas A. De Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.



By Mr. BOIES: A bill (H. R. 5041) granting a pension to Louisa Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 5042) for the relief of John Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLOUSE: A bill (H. R. 5043) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gallatin, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Livingston, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lebanon, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cookeville, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Byrdstown, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Crossville, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lafayette, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5050) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dayton, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5051) to renew patent No. 765486; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 5052) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Eleazer I. Hathaway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) granting a pension to Cora M. Ridgeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5054) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Marine on St. Croix, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 5055) for the relief of Ferdinand A. Roy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 5056) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jefferson, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5057) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pocahontas, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Dodge, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Denison, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Carroll, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockwell City, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Estherville, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Forest City, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Emmetsburg, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manning, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Garner, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boone, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Webster City, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Humboldt, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Algona, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Britt, State of Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 5072) for the relief of C. S. Thacker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 5073) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Springboro, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 5074) to carry out findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles H. Simmons; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) granting a pension to Harriet M. Tyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5076) granting a pension to George Francis Bemont; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5077) authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine and enter judgment upon claim of the Mystic Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5078) granting certain public lands to the State of Idaho for the benefit of the Idaho Soldiers' Home; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 5079) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Victor, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5080) granting a pension to Sarah Rosa; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5081) granting a pension to Amanda A. M. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) granting a pension to C. B. Chamness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) granting a pension to Edward Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5084) granting an increase of pension to William Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5085) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Skaggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5086) granting a pension to Sophia Doering; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) for the relief of James Shook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5088) granting a pension to Frank Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) granting a pension to Sam Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 5090) to provide for the retirement as second lieutenant of Field Artillery in the Army of Cadet Joseph P. Constantine, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5091) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dalmatia, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Herndon, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Trevorton, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5094) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mount Carmel, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5095) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shamokin, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5096) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Watsonstown, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Milton, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5098) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Northumberland, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sunbury, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Turbotville, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Washingtonville, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Danville, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bloomsburg, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5104) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Berwick, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5105) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Catawissa, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Centralia, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Benton, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of La Porte, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dushore, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mildred, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lopez, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 5112) granting a pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 5113) authorizing the President to appoint Carl J. Lehnhard a first lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) granting an increase of pension to Mary Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5115) granting an increase of pension to Francis Van Name; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) granting a pension to Mary J. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of New York: A bill (H. R. 5117) for the relief of William Bardel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) for the relief of Perley Morse & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5119) to reimburse the Midwood Park Property Owners' Association; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5120) for the relief of James W. O'Reilly; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5122) for the retirement of Clarence Capel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) for the relief of Almirall & Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5124) for the relief of George F. Ames; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5125) for the relief of Oliver A. Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOGAN: A bill (H. R. 5126) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear and determine the claim of the owners of the Danish steamship *Flynderborg* against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUHRING: A bill (H. R. 5127) granting a pension to Levi C. Posey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5128) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Crete, Saline County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5129) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wilber, Saline County, State of Nebraska,

one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5130) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wymore, Gage County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5131) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairbury, Jefferson County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beatrice, Gage County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5133) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Geneva, Fillmore County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5134) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of David City, Butler County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5135) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, Seward County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5136) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Shelby, Polk County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5137) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Aurora, Hamilton County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5138) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hebron, Thayer County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5139) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Osceola, Polk County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wahoo, Saunders County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5141) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Beaver Crossing, Seward County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seward, Seward County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Prague, Saunders County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5144) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of York, York County, State of Nebraska, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 5145) granting a pension to Abigail Snay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 5146) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 5147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of North Collins, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5148) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boston, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5149) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5150) granting a pension to Mary W. Shellabarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5151) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Dowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5152) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Lawrence Lightner Post, No. 92, American Legion, Utica, Ohio, one German machine gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 5153) granting a pension to Mary E. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 5154) granting a pension to Jennie Tann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hoosick Falls, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5156) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Whitehall, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Troy, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Glens Falls, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 5159) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Baylor, State of Texas, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINGEY: A bill (H. R. 5160) for the relief of Frank Carpenter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shawnee, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5162) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seminole, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5163) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Okemah, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5164) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tecumseh, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wewoka, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5166) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the City of Tishomingo, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coalgate, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5168) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holdenville, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ada, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5170) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5171) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chandler, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5172) for the relief of James Diamond for horse lost while hired by the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5173) for the relief of James A. Wolfe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5174) for the relief of Thomas Swatzell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5175) for the relief of George B. Robinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 5176) granting a pension to Eliza Hess Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Nathaniel M. Gregg, alias John Tammons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 5178) granting a pension to Mary Mahoney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) granting a pension to William Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 5180) for the relief of Victor Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) for the relief of Martin L. Cuppels; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5182) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) granting a pension to Jessie M. Leadbeater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) granting a pension to Abraham Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5185) granting a pension to Frances J. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) for the relief of Susan C. Bott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 5187) granting a pension to Melissa A. Sears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 5188) for the relief of Orlando Ducker, major and surgeon in the War with Spain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 5189) granting a pension to Elizabeth S. Taber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 5190) for the relief of Joseph Maier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 5191) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Argyle, Polk County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Erskine, Polk County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5193) granting a pension to Etta B. Julius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5194) granting a pension to H. C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) granting a pension to Mary Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5196) granting a pension to Comfort C. Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5197) granting a pension to Eliza J. Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5198) granting a pension to Belinda Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) granting a pension to Arbany Terry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5200) for the relief of Andrew L. Sharp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5201) granting a pension to Eveline Kear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) granting a pension to Louisa Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5203) granting a pension to Alice Jewett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5204) granting a pension to Lollie Massengale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 5205) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albany, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5206) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Troy, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5207) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Adairville, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 5208) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fort Jennings, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 5209) granting a pension to Emily J. Wales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD of New York: A bill (H. R. 5210) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Henry C. Davis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 5211) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Quakertown, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5212) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Bridgeport, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Churchville, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHALMERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) admitting George A. Huntley to the rights and privileges of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

285. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, favoring replacement of a statue to Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

286. By Mr. GILLETTE: Petition of residents of the second Massachusetts district, favoring repeal of 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

287. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Tuolumne Tribe, No. 247, Improved Order of Red Men, Turlock, Calif., favoring the enlargement of the Federal arsenal and military storage depot at Benicia, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

288. Also, petition of Golden West Lodge, No. 73, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Bakersfield, Calif., opposing the sales or turnover tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. By Mr. BUTLER (by request): Petition of G. A. Wehlheim and others, of Coatesville, Northbrook, Oak Lane, Darby, and Downingtown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against the passage of the bill creating a bureau for the control of professional licensure in the department of public instruction and against all bills with similar provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

290. Also (by request), petitions of Mary S. Osborn and others, of Coatesville; Marion E. Collins and others, of Avondale; and Elizabeth McMullen and others, of West Chester, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against the passage of the Capper-Fess education bill; to the Committee on Education.

291. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of various citizens of Herin, Ill., in favor of beer and light wine and opposed to Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

292. By Mr. FESS: Petition of sundry citizens of Mechanicsburg, Ohio, favoring the independence of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

293. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of the First Presbyterian Church, Tacoma, Wash., urging an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting the practice of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of John Kelly, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

295. Also, petition of the Bank of New York, regarding taxation in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

296. Also, petition of Lannan & Kemp (Inc.), of New York, favoring a sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

297. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of J. W. Preston and others, protesting against reflections of John B. Densmore on Casper A. Ornbaum, made in report on House resolution No. 225, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

298. By Mr. MAGEE: Petitions of Haberle Brewing Co., Thomas Ryan's Consumers' Brewing Co., and Moore & Quinn, all of Syracuse, N. Y., in favor of the repeal of internal-revenue tax now levied on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

299. By Mr. MANN: Petition of E. J. Steffens, Albert Goltz, John M. Brandenburg, John T. Dickinson, and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring amendment to the prohibition act, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

300. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Local No. 76, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring a tariff on pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

301. Also, petition of East Buffalo Brewing Co., regarding tax on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

302. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Garrison Lodge, No. 90, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, Garrison, N. Dak., and Mount Moriah Lodge, No. 51, Williston, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

303. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Louis C. Pazolt, furrier, of Boston, Mass., concerning proposed tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

304. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Willow Grove, Pa., opposing the passage of the Capper-Fess educational bills; to the Committee on Education.

305. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Rosenwald & Weil, Chicago, protesting against the French-Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

306. Also, petition of E. C. Hill, of Chicago, protesting against an excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 26, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 25, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINS). The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrell	Moses	Smoot
Ball	Harris	Nelson	Spencer
Borah	Harrison	New	Stanfield
Broussard	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Stanley
Bursum	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Sterling
Calder	Kendrick	Norris	Sutherland
Cameron	Kenyon	Oddie	Townsend
Caraway	Keyes	Overman	Trammell
Colt	King	Phipps	Underwood
Culberson	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Ladd	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	La Follette	Pomerene	Warren
Dial	Lenroot	Reed	Watson, Ga.
Dillingham	Lodge	Reed	Williams
Ernst	McCormick	Robinson	Willis
France	McKellar	Sheppard	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Shields	
Gooding	McLean	Shortridge	
Hale	McNary	Simmons	

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HEFLIN] is unavoidably detained from the Senate on public business. I ask that this announcement may stand for to-day and to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LADD presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

## Senate concurrent resolution.

A concurrent resolution beseeching Congress to request the Joint International Boundary Commission to take action looking to the solution of the problem of controlling floods in the valley of the Red River in the United States and Canada.

Whereas there are vast problems in flood control and drainage affecting the 110,000 square miles comprising the valley of the Red River in Canada and the United States which can not be solved without cooperation and joint action of these two countries: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully and urgently petition Congress to request the Joint International Boundary Commission to call a conference at some city near the international boundary and follow same with such action as will enable the two countries to confine and perfect the necessary desired action relating to the control of the floods of the Red River.

I, W. J. PRATER, secretary of the senate of the seventeenth legislative assembly, do hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the State of North Dakota on the 7th day of February, 1921, and was concurred in by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota on the same day.

W. J. PRATER,  
Secretary of the Senate of North Dakota.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 22d day of April, 1921.

Mr. KNOX presented resolutions of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
Harrisburg, April 14, 1921.

PENNSYLVANIA, ss:

I do hereby certify that the following is a full, true, and correct copy of the original resolution of the general assembly, No. 4-B, as the same remains on file in this office:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
April 6, 1921.

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does respectfully request Congress of the United States to adopt legislation which will provide for retirement privileges for disabled emergency officers of the Army under the same conditions now provided by law for officers of the Regular Army in so far as regards physical disability in line of duty.

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forward a copy of this resolution to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and a copy to each Member and Senator from Pennsylvania in Congress of the United States.

THOMAS H. GARVIN,  
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The foregoing resolution was concurred in by the Senate April 7, 1921.

W. P. GALLAGHER,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the secretary's office to be affixed, the day and year above written.

[SEAL.]

FREDERIC A. GODEFRUES,  
Deputy Secretary of the Commonwealth.